

1
2 YUKON-KUSKOKWIM DELTA,
3 WESTERN INTERIOR,
4 EASTERN INTERIOR
5 FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS
6 JOINT MEETING

7 Taken at:
8 Millenium Hotel
9 Anchorage, Alaska

10 October 10, 2001

11 Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta Council Members
12 Present:

13 Harry Wilde, Sr. Chair
14 John Hanson
15 Mary Gregory
16 Fritz L. George
17 Willard Church
18 Robert Nick
19 Billy McCann
20 James A. Charles
21 Phillip Moses
22 Lester Wilde, Sr.
23 Alvin Owletuck

24 Western Interior Council Members Present:

25 Ron Sam, Chair
Raymond Collins
Jack L. Reakoff
Sampson Henry
Angela O. Demientieff
Benedict Jones
Carl Morgan

Eastern Interior Council Members Present

Gerald Nicholia, Chair
Jim Wilde
David James

1 Coordinators:

2 Alex Nick, Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta
3 Vince Mathews, Western Interior
4 Donald Mike, Eastern Interior

5 Others Present:

6 Audra Brase, ADF&G; Eva Bryant, Yupik
7 Translator; Marie Meade, Yupik Translator;
8 Stanley Ned, TCC; Larry Boyle, ADF&G;
9 Michael Martin; John Nicholas; Nick Frank;
10 Bob Lafferty, ADF&G; Jerry Berg, US FWS;
11 Bill Knauer, US FWS; Adelheid Herrmann,
12 BSFA; Pete Probasco, US FWS; Bob Karlen,
13 BLM; Ingrid McSweeny, BLM; Carl Kretsinger,
14 BLM; Dave Anderson; Janet Cohen, NPS; Tim
15 Craig, BLM; Cassandra Tulloch, US FWS; John
16 Burr, ADF&G; George Sherrod, US FWS; Hollis
17 Twitchell, Denali NP; Frank Charles,
18 Kuskokwim River Salmon Working Group; Carl
19 Jack, OSM; Gerry C. Keffer; Geoff Byerdorf;
20 Rod Simmons, US FWS; Sandy Rabinowitch, NPS;
21 Charlie Burkey, Jr., ADF&G; I.L. Andrew;
22 David Enoch; Henry Lupie; Sandra Frazier;
23 Jennifer Hooper, AVCP; Patrick Snow, US FWS;
24 Wally Suroka, US FWS; Jeff Denton, BLM;
25 Wayne Morgan, KNA; Jill Klein, YRDFA; Ken
Harper, US FWS; Richard Davis; Paul
Liedberg, US FWS; Richard Uberuaga, US FWS;
Jay Stevens, SVS NRP; Michael Rearden, Yukon
Delta NWR; Polly Wheeler, ADF&G; Michael
Coffing, ADF&G; Jeff Adams, US FWS; James
Schwarber, ADF&G; Edgar Holnh; Greg
McClella, Koyukuk/Nowitna NWR; Don Rivard,
US FWS; Dan Bergstrom, ADF&G; Connie Friend,
Tetlin NWR; Robert Schultz; Bill Schiff,
Innoko NWR; Wassilie Bavilla; Annie
Cleveland, NVK; Laddy Elliott; Della
Trumble, Kodiak/Aleutians RAC; Orville
Huntington; Ida Hildebrand, BIA; Bob
Gerhard, NPS; Ruth Gronquist, BLM; Dan
LaPlant US FWS; Pat McClenahan, US FWS;
Richard Wilmot, NMFS; Cliff Schleusner, US
FWS; Ann Wilkinson, US FWS; Angela Morgan,
KNA; Tom Kron, US FWS; Greg Bos, US FWS;
Pamela Moreno; Paul Hunter, NPS; D.E.
Phelps, Jr; Andrew Slaughter; Karen Gillis,
Bering Strait Fishermen's Association; Nick

1 Frank; Paul Liedberg, Yukon Delta NWR; Terry
2 L. Haynes, ADF&G; Sabrina Fernandez,
3 Attorney General's Office; Donald Runsfelt;
4 Michelle Horner; Pat Petrivelli US FWS;
5 Taylor Brelsford; Stanley Ned, TCC; Sam
6 Henry; Ted Hamilton, Randy Brown, US FWS;
7 Elizabeth Marry, ADN; G. Kevin Van Hatten;
8 Devi Sharp, Wrangell-St. Elias NP; Eric
9 Veach, Wrangell-St. Elias NP; Mason Reid,
10 Wrangell-St. Elias NP; Rob McWhorter, Joint
11 Pipeline Office; Mike McDougall, YRDFA; Fred
12 Bue, ADF&G; John Burr, ADF&G; Patrick Snow,
13 US FWS; Orville Huntington; Brenda Tabes
14 Horse, BLM.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. SAM: I'd like to reconvene
the joint council meetings.

3 As Chair, I'd like to convene the
4 joint council meeting between YK Delta,
Vince.

5 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, just
a couple of housekeeping things. First off,
6 we need everyone to sign in at the sign-in
sheets. That would help her know who is
7 here all day.

8 MS. GREGORY: Can we get that so
we can pass it around?

9
10 MR. MATHEWS: One of us will go
and get some sign-in sheets for you also.
For all the people that are in the audience,
11 if you can, sign in. One is so we get the
spelling correct and the agencies, if you
12 are involved in agencies, correctly reflect
it and then we have a count of who is here.

13 Other things that we need to go
over is with handouts again. They're piling
14 up here. What we would request is that
people who are doing the handouts give them
15 to one of the three coordinators here.
We'll make sure the translators,
16 transcribers, and council members get copies
and from there copies will be distributed.
17 If there's not enough copies available for
those in the crowd or audience or agencies,
18 then we can make arrangements to get copies.

19 Let's see, so we have sign-in, we
have copies.

Oh, translators, yes. We need to
20 assist the translators. You saw me kind of
accelerate there, I immediately look at
21 Sandi's eyes, her eyebrows are going up. I
know we're kind of going fast. We need to
22 slow down just a little bit just to make
sure that the translation and transcribing
23 go on.

Doesn't mean we have to go very,
24 very slow, just means we have to be a little
bit more -- just a little bit slower. The
25 suggestion is you take a breath every three
words is what I've been doing.

1 Anyway, those will be
2 housekeeping. I'll ask the other
3 coordinators if there's any other
4 housekeeping items.

5 Seeing none. For travel, I'm
6 assuming all of you have met with Cassandra
7 yesterday -- Mary, did you -- yes, I hope,
8 got your per diem check and your travel
9 forms. For those that had ticket problems,
10 I'm hoping you met with Cassandra to address
11 your ticket problems. That needs to be done
12 at this time -- well, government work by
13 paperwork, the longer you wait, the more the
14 paperwork. So, please during the breaks or
15 that -- get ahold of one of us if that has
16 not been resolved.

17 What I'm getting at, some of you
18 had to purchase your own tickets due to
19 whatever reasons. We need to help you get
20 reimbursed or straighten that all out.

21 Let us know on that. So, that's
22 it.

23 If there's need for water,
24 coffee, or whatever, let us know.

25 MS. GREGORY: We need water over
here.

 MR. MATHEWS: You need water over
there.

 James, over there is kind of the
water person.

 I can't think of anything else.
We've done very well with the microphones of
turning them on and off, so that's not a
problem. That's all. Thank you.

 MR. SAM: All right. I have to
try my powerful mike here.

 MR. MATHEWS: Just so you know,
the Chair that's running the meeting has the
authority to override any testimony through
a button on his. So, he's telling me too
much. Just so you know that that is a
situation, and then the Chair can explain to
the speaker why he or she needed to cut them
off.

 Anyways, that's all we have for
housekeeping. If you have any other issues;

1 council members or agencies, the
2 coordinators are here. The other team
3 members are Tom Kron, Jerry Berg, Pete
4 DeMatteo, George Sherrod, and Laura
Jurgensen are here at various times.
Utilize them to address your concern.

Thank you.

5 MR. SAM: Thank you, Vince, for
6 all the housekeeping and everything else.
7 We tend to forget to sign in at times. But
8 for the most part, I took it for granted
9 that once we took a roll call we would
10 automatically include it as being present.

Without further adieu, I'd like
to begin the Wednesday session.

11 I stand -- both the trees -- we
12 all three recognized the quorum, so we
13 decided not to have a roll call because we
14 already counted our people.

15 Histories re -- Fisheries
16 Resource Monitoring Program.
17 Vince?

18 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman,
19 your agenda is a little bit off here.
20 Basically, what we're doing is the Yukon
21 River drainage first, which is under Tab D
22 as in Delta, and that will be broken up into
23 2000 and 2001 project updates, followed by
24 2002 projects. The agenda is a little bit
25 off there. We're basically doing Yukon,
then we're doing Kuskokwim. Following that
will be special reports and they'll be
introduced, I believe, by staff from the
Fishery Information Service office. One of
them will probably introduce the speakers
that follow this section.

The first section is basically:
They're going to lay these out, past
projects, ongoing projects, and new
projects.

They're looking from you for your
recommendation on the 2002 projects. So you
are in a recommendation situation here this
morning.

24 MR. SAM: Thank you, Vince.
25 State your name, please.

1 Fish & Game completed the study on the
2 traditional ecological knowledge from the
3 Yukon Flats Region on beaver/whitefish
4 interactions.

5 Currently, the Yukon Region
6 Resource Monitoring Program is funding 13
7 salmon stock assessment projects. Five of
8 these are weir projects.

9 Most of the weir projects in the
10 Yukon River Drainage were impacted by high
11 water this spring. Here are the locations
12 of the five weir projects:

13 The Henshaw Creek weir projects
14 operated by the USF and U.S. Fish & Wildlife
15 Service was installed by June 25th and
16 reported higher counts for summer chum and
17 chinook than the 2000 season.

18 Installation of the East Fork
19 Andreafsky weir project operated by the
20 Bering Sea Fishermen's Association was
21 delayed until July 11th due to high water.

22 Project 58 replaced the damaged
23 weir panels on the East Fork Andreafsky
24 weir.

25 The Nulato River weir operated by
the Bering Sea Fishermen's Association was
not installed due to high water and damaged
panels. A picket weir was installed and
tower counts conducted but crew problems and
equipment problems and equipment failure
prematurely ended the project.

And the Kateel River weir
operated by the US Fish & Wildlife office
was not installed due to high water and
delays in the shipment of the weir. The
materials for the weir are now stored onsite
and will be ready for 2002.

Two of the additional stock
assessment projects are Test Fisheries and
two projects that support ongoing salmon
work in the Yukon.

The Hooper Bay Test Fishery is an
Alaska Department of Fish & Game and Hooper
Bay Tribal Council project collecting
catch-per-unit effort data and run timing
for summer chum and chinook salmon from
subsistence fishermen at Hooper Bay.

The Lower Yukon Cooperative Test
Fishery project operated by the Alaska
Department of Fish & Game and the Emmonak

1 Tribal Council collects run timing and
2 relative abundance data on chinook, summer
3 and fall chum, and coho salmon. The
4 establishment of the Middle Mouth test site
5 allowed better coverage of salmon stocks
6 entering the Yukon River.

7 The Upper Kantishna River Fish
8 Wheel operated by the National Park Service
9 supports the recapture portion of the
10 mark-recapture study looking at abundance
11 and run timing in fall chum salmon in the
12 Kantishna River.

13 And the Kaltag A-S-L Scale
14 Sampling Project operated by the city of
15 Kaltag collected age scales and documented
16 the sex/length distribution of
17 subsistence-caught chinook salmon.

18 The Yukon Resource Monitoring
19 Program is funding four mainstem salmon
20 assessment projects.

21 The Pilot Station Project
22 replaced deteriorating dual-beam sonar
23 equipment purchased in the mid-80s by the
24 Alaska Department of Fish & Game. The new
25 technology associated with the split-beam
sonar system allows managers to store data
electronically, determine direction of
travel, and possibly automate the counting
process.

The Rampart-Rapids Tagging
Project funds the US Fish & Wildlife Service
operation of the mark-recapture study at
Rampart to estimate the weekly abundance of
fall chum in the mainstem Yukon River.
Concerns over increased mortality of chum
salmon from handling stress closed the
project early in 1999.

Project 177 funded additional
staff at the Ramparts recovery wheel to
minimize the handling and holding times for
the salmon. This allowed the Rampart-Rapids
Tagging Project to continue providing
abundance estimates for fall chum salmon.

The Rampart-Rapids video
monitoring operated by Stan Zuray collects
catch-per-unit-effort data on chinook,
summer chum, sheefish, broad humpback, and
cisco whitefish. This project is being
developed as a less stressful alternative
method for collecting data on run timing,

1 catch-per-unit-effort and recapture rates.

2 Four biological studies were
3 funded through the Yukon Resource Monitoring
4 Program.

5 The Dall River Northern Pike
6 Study is a cooperative project between the
7 Alaska Department of Fish & Game and the
8 Stevens Village Natural Resource Office.
9 The project funded 20 transmitters used to
10 track and describe the adult northern pike
11 stock in the Dall River area.

12 The Yukon Flats Northern Pike
13 Study is a continuation of the Dall River
14 Northern Pike Study and was funded in
15 response to the concerns of local
16 subsistence fishermen over increased
17 recreational use of northern pike stocks
18 near Stevens Village. The Alaska Department
19 of Fish & Game and the Stevens Village
20 Natural Resource Office are conducting the
21 telemetry study on adult northern pike in
22 the Old Lost Creek and Dall River areas,
23 describing seasonal movement and site
24 fidelity.

25 The Humpback Whitefish
Distribution and the Upper Tanana River
Project was funded in response to local
concerns over declining whitefish
populations. This project is a US Fish &
Wildlife radio telemetry study looking at
site fidelity, feeding areas, spawning
sites, and over wintering areas for humpback
whitefish in the Upper Tanana River
drainage.

Dr. Kocan and Dr. Hershberger
from the University of Washington are
conducting the ichthyophonous study on
chinook salmon. In 2001 samples were
collected for lab analysis from Emmonak,
Tanana, Rampart-Rapids, Tanana
River-Fairbanks, Chena River-Chena Hot
Springs, and Dawson and Whitehorse in the
Yukon Territories. This is the third year
they have been looking at ichthyophonous in
chinook salmon in the Yukon, and they will
be presenting some of their results here
today.

Four of the currently funded
projects in the Yukon have a strong capacity
building component.

1 The YRDFA Teleconference Project
2 provided additional funding to cover the
3 operational cost of the weekly
4 teleconference between in-season managers
5 and subsistence fishermen.

6 The Pilot Station Technician
7 Support Project was the second year of
8 funding provided to the Association of
9 Village Council Presidents to fund a local
10 hire and to work at the Pilot Station sonar
11 project.

12 The Tanana Fisheries Conservation
13 Outreach Program provided opportunities for
14 school children and Elders in Tanana to
15 visit fisheries projects and interact with
16 biologists in the Rampart-Rapids area.

17 The GASH Working Group Project
18 was funded in response to the conflicts in
19 recreational and subsistence use of moose
20 and northern pike in Grayling, Anvik,
21 Shageluk, and Holy Cross region. An initial
22 agency scoping meeting has been held and has
23 identified several issues and action items.
24 Scoping sessions are planned for this winter
25 in the GASH villages to discuss issues and
 information needs and identify possible
 solutions to regional resource issues. Bill
 Schaff, the Innoko National Wildlife Refuge
 manager will be presenting an update on the
 GASH project on Thursday.

 Currently, there are six harvest
 monitoring and traditional ecological
 knowledge or TEK projects funded in the
 Yukon Region. The TEK of Freshwater Fishes
 in Eagle and Circle project funds the Native
 Village of Eagle to collect traditional
 information on use and ecology of chinook
 and chum salmon as well as pike, grayling,
 and burbot from the communities of Eagle and
 Circle.

 The Old John Lake TEK project is
 collecting information on historic
 subsistence use of the fish from Old John
 Lake as well as information on ecology of
 the species, food preparation, and fishing
 techniques. This is a cooperative project
 between the Alaska Department of Fish &
 Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and
 Arctic Village.

 The Arctic Village Harvest

1 Monitoring Project is collecting information
2 describing the subsistence harvest and
3 fishing techniques of the residents of
4 Arctic Village. This is also a cooperative
5 project between the Alaska Department of
6 Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service,
7 and Arctic Village.

8 The Yukon River Salmon TEK
9 project funds YRDFA to hold meetings and
10 conduct interviews in the villages of
11 Alakanuk, St. Marys, Holy Cross, and Nulato
12 to collect traditional ecological
13 information on salmon species in the Lower
14 Yukon.

15 The Contemporary Subsistence Uses
16 of Non-Salmon Fish project in the Koyukuk
17 River is collecting local ecological
18 information on non-salmon fish species from
19 the villages in the Koyukuk River drainage.
20 Alaska Department of Fish & Game and the
21 Tanana Chiefs Conference will estimate
22 non-salmon fish species harvested from the
23 communities of the Koyukuk River drainage in
24 the second phase of this project.

25 The Upper Yukon, Porcupine, and
Black River Salmon TEK Evaluation Project
funds the Council of Athabascan Tribal
Governments and the Alaska Department of
Fish & Game to collect historical
information identifying long-term changes in
salmon ecology and subsistence management
issues.

Now, on to the Inter-Regional
Projects. Detailed information on the
status of inter-regional funded projects as
well as information on how to obtain copies
of the completed reports is provided in the
handout entitled "Fisheries Resource
Monitoring Program 2000-2001
Inter-Regional."

Some more detailed information is
in here than will be presented today.

One inter-regional project has
been completed. The objective of this study
was to develop a statewide management
strategy for subsistence harvest assessment.
The Alaska Department of Fish & Game and the
Alaska Inter-Tribal Council have completed
the project and have produced three reports.

Currently the Resource Monitoring

1 Program is funding three inter-regional
2 stock status and trends projects.
3 Integrated data management and information
4 transfer is a priority for Tribal, State,
5 and Federal in-season managers to make
6 informed decisions. Two inter-regional
7 projects address this issue.

8 The Shared Information for
9 Fisheries Management and AYK project is
10 funding the Alaska Department of Fish & Game
11 to develop a data management system for the
12 Arctic, Kotzebue, Norton Sound, Yukon, and
13 Kuskokwim Rivers resource monitoring
14 programs.

15 The Regulatory History of
16 Subsistence Salmon Fishing Regulations in
17 the YK is another Alaska Department of Fish
18 & Game project that is compiling a history
19 of the fishing regulations in the Yukon and
20 Kuskokwim drainages from 1957 to present.
21 This project was initiated over concerns
22 over the impacts of regulations on
23 subsistence harvest.

24 Project Information and Access is
25 a multi-agency project including the Alaska
Department of Fish & Game, Forest Service,
National Parks Service, and the U.S. Fish &
Wildlife Service. This project is
developing recommendations for the design of
a statewide database for historic and new
subsistence data.

There are two inter-regional,
harvest monitoring and TEK projects.

The Validity and Reliability of
Fisheries Harvest Assessment Methods Project
is evaluating data collected in subsistence
harvest monitoring plans in the Kuskokwim
drainage and Southeast Alaska and will
provide recommendations to improve current
harvest assessment procedures.

And finally, the implementation
of a statewide Subsistence Fisheries Harvest
Assessment Strategy Project funds the Alaska
Department of Fish & Game and the Alaska
Inter-Tribal Council to present regional
workshops and develop regional operation
plans for the statewide subsistence harvest
program.

I would like to thank the members
of the Tri-Councils for their leadership,

1 hard work, and support for this program.
2 This presentation briefly touched on 37
3 projects originally presented and approved
4 by the three councils as draft monitoring
5 plans in 2000 and 2001. These projects
6 cover over 1600 miles of river and a broad
7 range of difficult and technical issues,
8 involving complex partnerships and a
9 tremendous amount of on-the-ground effort.

Mr. Chairman, I'll be glad to
answer any questions on the 2000-2001
Monitoring Program at this time.

MR. SAM: Are there any questions
for Cliff?

MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, Cliff,
there's a count at the tower? Who does
that, or guys associated with BLM?

MR. SCHLEUSNER: There was a
counting tower that was closed?

MR. NICHOLIA: No, it was open,
king salmon and chum salmon on up to the
river, up above 12 miles from Tanana.

MR. SCHLEUSNER: That wasn't --
isn't one of our projects, no.

MR. SAM: Lester and then John.

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: You
stated that Hooper Bay test fishery was a
test fishery. Are you going to be expanding
that? Is that going to an instance you're
going to expand that or actually testing?

MR. SCHLEUSNER: Currently, no,
there is no plans to expand that into a test
fishery. Although, I did get some excellent
reports from the Alaska Department of Fish &
Game on the reports from the Hooper Village.
Fred Bue said that the information really
was helpful in helping them to evaluate the
run timing.

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Would it
be possible to get more funding to make that
a test fishery, as stated in your report?

1 MR. SCHLEUSNER: There is always
2 that possibility, and we welcome any
3 proposals that you'd propose to the Office
of Subsistence Management.

4 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: We are
5 intending to make a proposal to make that a
test fishery.

6 MR. SCHLEUSNER: I look forward
7 to seeing that.

8 MR. SAM: All right, John.

9 MR. HANSON: Thank you, Mr.
10 Chairman, I didn't hear you say on one of
11 your projects, the tagging project -- Fish &
Wildlife that started it last year or
somebody else will talk about.

12 MR. CANNON: Yes, John, Richard
13 Cannon, Office of Subsistence Management,
I'll respond to John's question.

14 John, some of the projects, like
15 the Marshall Test Fishery Project are
16 associated with projects that are funded
17 from other sources, for example, the Alaska
Department of Fish & Game has disaster
relief funds as well as their own general
fund projects, and that's not one of your
Council's projects, but it certainly is an
important project.

18 What we're trying to do is to
19 work with all of the various participants,
20 State, Federal, and local to try, in this
21 program and try to pick those things where
we can help, help with the overall effort.
And some of the things that you're aware of
out on the river, this project isn't
funding.

22 It's all part of the whole. It's
23 also important. But it's just not something
that we're going to report on at this time.

24 MR. SAM: Any further questions
25 for Rich or Cliff?
Harry?

MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.:

1 Mr. Chairman, how about Mountain Village
2 Test Fishery?

3 I think Tribal there is planning
4 to make their own proposal to run that that
5 they're capable. I don't know how many
6 years they had been running it. I think if
7 they do it themselves right there, they had
8 some boys and people -- I think that they do
9 it -- they have been doing an excellent job
10 with sonar above them is with -- when sonar
11 is slacked out, that -- is up, that thing is
12 really dependable to the sonar.

13 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, Harry,
14 yes, the Mountain Village Test Fishery
15 Project has proven to be a very valuable
16 project, and it has tracked well with Pilot
17 Station; and when Pilot Station was done,
18 it's been used to provide information about
19 the timing and relative abundance of salmon.

20 That project is one that is
21 funded with other sources; but, again, like
22 I was saying, it's part of the whole. When
23 Gene Sandone gave his presentation yesterday
24 on U.S./ Canada, he mentioned this plan is
25 to begin a strategic plan from the Yukon as
part of U.S./Canada work. Well, we're
looking forward to being a part of that
process, because a strategic plan is needed
for the Yukon to bring all these projects
together in a real and more of a directed
way.

And so in the future, if the
Council wants us to talk more about some of
the other projects, we can do that.

Today, we're just focused on the
things that your money -- the money that's
come to this program is funding.

That's the kind of feedback we're
looking for.

MR. SAM: Yeah, thanks, Rich, for
that clarification.

Again, I just wanted that
understood that we -- we know that there are
other programs and other surveys done out
there, but, however, they are being funded
either recently or people go out there and
find their own funding.

John?

1

MR. HANSON: Yeah, thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

2

3

4

5

6

Rich, in January when I was here
for the Board of Fish meeting, I gave you a
list -- I think there was three -- three on
that list that I gave you for a study on
projects, and one of them was Black River.
Is there anything being done on that, having
a test fishery in Black River?

10

11

12

13

14

MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, John,
that -- there was nothing came in to us in
the way of a preproposal. The way this
works is that we identify the issues and
needs through the Council, and then a call
for proposals goes out to everyone from the
Tribal groups, State and the Federal, and
they come back to us and with their
proposals, if they want to do a project.

And, no, we haven't gotten
anything yet on Black River. That's the way
this process works is that the call is
important when we make it for different
types of issues and needs. Somebody has to
respond to that call.

15

16

17

18

MR. HANSON: Thanks, Rich.

I think having a test fishery in
the Black River would really help. You'd
have Hooper Bay, Black River, and then the
Yukon. Because the fish -- they hit Hooper
Bay first, and then Black River is next.
That way you'd have a better monitoring feel
for the migration of the salmon.

19

20

21

MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, John,
are you interested in doing something
similar to what's being done at Hooper Bay
with reporting the catches from the
subsistence fisheries?

22

23

24

25

MR. HANSON: Yeah, Rich. That
would be similar to Hooper Bay project.
Salmon comes to Black River and that's where
they have their summer camp. If there was a
test fishery there, it would really help the
amount of ADF&G -- they did all this from
Hooper, Black River, and then us subsistence
fishermen from the might all the way up.

1
2 MR. CANNON: Thank you, John. We
3 can look into that for you, and we'll talk
4 to the Fish & Game people and some of the
5 other people out there about the
6 possibility.

7 MR. SAM: Any further questions
8 for Rich or Cliff?
9 Jack?

10 MR. REAKOFF: I think all these
11 projects are very worthwhile, are very
12 instrumental in the management of these
13 during these trying times in the Yukon and
14 Kuskokwim fisheries. I missed who is going
15 to make this strategy for putting all these
16 projects together.

17 MR. CANNON: That would -- excuse
18 me, that is an effort that the State of
19 Alaska, Alaska Department of Fish & Game is
20 planning to initiate this coming year; and I
21 don't know much about the details of that,
22 but it's something that I think we all are
23 going to look forward to seeing and
24 participating in. It's part of the
25 U.S./Canada process, and Gene Sandone,
regional supervisor with ADF&G, is the one
that announced that yesterday.

MR. SAM: Gerald?

MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, I would like
to -- according to that memoranda of
agreement, are you guys going to be sharing
all the information back and forth with the
State?

MR. CANNON: Yes, Gerald. That's
an important part of this process. You'll
notice some of the projects do information
sharing. In fact, our presentation back to
you, we look at that as part of that process
too and having special speakers come.
Definitely we give this information to both
Tribal, State, and other Federal groups.
This information is made available to
everyone.

Carl?

1 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I'm in favor
2 of all these test fisheries. I'm glad to
3 see it. However, I'd like to see -- we've
4 got these test fisheries in the end river
5 systems now, whether it be the Kuskokwim or
6 the Yukon. We've been pointing fingers at
7 everybody else, but we've got to put the
8 horse before the cart and start doing these
9 test fisheries either in area M and find out
10 if they're intercepting or do a test fishery
11 out there. We got to find out. We can't
12 keep pointing the fingers. We got data, we
13 got to make it solid. It's great to have
14 the test fishery in the rivers. It's almost
15 too late when it comes in. We want to know
16 where the salmon are traveling to. We don't
17 know. Like one of our co-chairs, Chairman
18 says we've got to see if it is the high-seas
19 intercept. Right now we're doing all these
20 little test fisheries in these little
21 streams that's after the fact.

22 Let's -- that's great, I want to
23 see it, and we've got to do it. I don't
24 know who's got the -- I don't want to get
25 too personal or who is going to tackle this.

26 We've got to know what's
27 happening out there in the ocean. I
28 think -- and we've heard it from the
29 Governor, from the Alaska Department of Fish
30 & Game, it's the intercept. Okay. Let's
31 put some money there and let's find out
32 where, who, what, why. We know what's
33 happening in the rivers. We've got to know
34 what's happening in the ocean.

35 Thank you.

36 MR. SAM: Jack?

37 MR. REAKOFF: That was my next
38 point, was the marine -- there's a lot of
39 agencies doing marine monitoring, you know,
40 ocean temperatures and all that. It would
41 be nice to see some data brought in to this
42 program, you know, like why these -- how the
43 correlations of why these runs fell out
44 after mid-point in the season. There must
45 be some marine indicators, some data that
46 could be obtained from other agencies that
47 can be instrumental in information casting
48 these run depletions and so forth. Also the

1 intercept -- you know, what the trawl fleet
2 and what other fisheries by-catch would be.

3 MR. SAM: Thank you, Jack.
4 Before we go any further, just for your
5 information, I would like to have you
6 council members look at our agenda and
7 through the good graces and persistence of
8 Eastern Interior Regional Council, they
9 invited National Marine Fisheries, and
10 they'll be on first thing in the morning, so
11 I would urge all of you present who are
12 concerned about this National Marine
13 Fisheries issue be here tomorrow morning.

14 So, Gerald, I'd like to thank
15 Eastern Interior for asking them to be on
16 the table.

17 MR. NICHOLIA: That's my next
18 question. Since both the National Marine
19 Fisheries and Office of Subsistence
20 Management, Federal agencies, are you guys
21 going to be working together? Craig Fleener
22 has been working on the issues to get the
23 National Marine Fisheries involved. If we
24 get you guys to work with them, are you
25 willing to work with them to see what kind
of high seas situations our salmon are going
through? It's going to be -- it's not going
to be like a closed-door deal, like they
hold back information, and you guys hold
back information, what me and Craig wanted
was to see that you guys work openly.

18 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman, I
19 think that there wouldn't be any problem at
20 all with the sharing of information with the
21 National Marine Services and working
22 collaboratively. The only issue would
23 become any jurisdictional matters; whether
24 or not there was jurisdiction for our
25 program to operate in the marine systems.
But as far as sharing data and working
collaboratively, I think that's a great
suggestion. And then, of course, that would
be the way that we will proceed.

24 MR. SAM: James Charles?

25 MR. CHARLES: Thank you, Mr.

1 Chairman. We have one test fishing in
2 Kuskokwim and it's in Bethel. We used to
3 have a test fishing down at the mouth by
4 Department of Fish & Game before but it's
5 not -- they're not test fishing out there
6 anymore. And last winter, for the fish cut
7 down the fishery over there in Quinhagak,
8 because there was -- they were seeing that
9 that's -- they were catching Kuskokwim fish
10 there, and is there a plan for any more
11 studies there on Kuskokwim since I see
12 notations noted in monitoring?

13 MR. CANNON: James, when Cliff is
14 done with the Yukon, I'll be giving a
15 presentation on the Kuskokwim program.
16 You're asking about other test fisheries in
17 the Kuskokwim? There's not a proposal at
18 this point to do any additional test
19 fisheries, but we can talk about that more
20 when we get on to the Kuskokwim, if you'd
21 like.

22 MR. SAM: Fritz?

23 MR. GEORGE: Thank you,
24 Mr. Chairman. Sometimes, you know, during
25 the test fisheries season, like early
spring, the water is very high, and seems
like -- permitted to fishing in the
Kuskokwim, is like 45 if it's a king gear
and 45 if it's a chum gear. When the
water's high with the Department service
permit, the test fisheries to use a deeper
net, you know, when the water's high, the
fish are swimming way under, way down there.

19 Somehow the test fishers missed
20 the salmon in Bethel but we fill the boat
21 right away in Noatak. Would you answer that
22 question letting them use the deeper net?

23 MR. CANNON: Yes, with regard to
24 the test fisheries and the depth of the net,
25 we would allow, of course, the investigators
to change the length of the net if they
wanted to.

24 The problem, though, with the
25 test fishery -- it's like a rain gauge.
You're just getting sort of an index of all
the -- of what's going on. So you don't

1 want to change it. You want to keep it the
2 same so you can compare it year to year.

3 A lot of times the people who are
4 doing test fisheries don't like to change
5 the gear because they want to compare things
6 year to year to year, fish the same mesh
7 size, fish the same way so that it can be
8 comparable.

9 MR. SAM: Any further questions?
10 Jack?

11 MR. REAKOFF: What was stated
12 yesterday was that, you know, the water
13 depth is not accounted for in the data, and
14 that's what the glitch is, is the depths of
15 the water is not taken into consideration,
16 and then for the data, it's not the same
17 every year because the water fluctuation.

18 MR. CANNON: Gentlemen, Jack. On
19 the Kuskokwim at the test fishery near
20 Bethel, they do consider the water levels,
21 and they use the hydrograph to compare
22 different groups of years where they've had
23 similar water levels. So -- in that
24 project, they do try to take that into
25 account.

MR. SAM: Any further questions?
If not, Vince, where are we? I
know we started out a little bit backwards.

MR. MATHEWS: We're now right on
time. You're going to go to the 2002
projects for the Yukon. You're going to
look at the projects that technical review
committee is recommending going forward for
funding, so they're asking for your
concurrence with that. Cliff is ready to
make a presentation on that.

MR. SAM: Yeah. Thank you,
Vince. We don't have to change people now?

MR. MATHEWS: No, Cliff is
multifaceted.

MR. SAM: Just to clarify some

1 things for the council members. At our
2 protocol meetings and Chair's teleconference
3 calls all through the summer, especially our
4 little protocol meeting downstairs the first
5 night, when I give you the mike, just keep
6 going, keep on in your question, because one
7 of the biggest dissatisfactions with our
8 meetings before was that people tend to walk
9 away with the feeling that they weren't
10 answered. So, if I give you the mike, keep
11 the mike until you get the answer. I think
12 that was covered very clearly in our
13 protocol meeting.

14 Without further adieu, back to
15 Cliff.

16 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
17 this presentation is on the 2002 Draft
18 Fisheries Monitoring Plan for the Yukon
19 Region.

20 This report is on the
21 recommendations of the technical review
22 committee. The TRC is a multi-agency panel
23 that reviews proposals for the Fisheries
24 Resource Monitoring Program.

25 The TRC is comprised of five
fisheries biologists, one geneticist, and
two social scientists.

Each proposal is evaluated on
scientific merit, past performance of
investigators, capacity building, and
strategic priorities.

The strategic priorities for the
projects include: The recommendations of
the Regional Advisory Councils, Federal
jurisdiction, conservation risks for the
species, subsistence allocation priority,
data gaps, resource importance, and local
concern.

The Federal Subsistence Board
will not fund projects involving hatcheries,
contaminants, or habitat restoration or
protection.

This graph is found in Section D,
page 5 of your book.

I'll give you a moment to find
this because it's kind of a complicated one.

This graph shows the current
funding commitments for the Statewide
Fisheries Resource Monitoring Program, as

1 well as projected commitments through 2004.
2 Most monitoring projects are long-term by
3 nature; our funding cycle obligated funds
4 from one to three years. The effect of
5 multiple-year obligations on the dollar
6 amount available for current new year starts
7 is clearly seen in this graph. Black
8 represents projects started in 2000; blue
9 represents projects started in 2001; and
10 yellow is the proposed monitoring plan
11 before you today. The red in the graph
12 represents the new Partners for Fisheries
13 Program funding.

14 In 2002, approximately \$5 million
15 is required to fund the continuation of
16 projects started in 2000 and 2001. This
17 leaves approximately 2.1 million statewide
18 for new starts in 2002. The Yukon River
19 Region received approximately 413,000 to
20 fund new starts for projects in 2002.

21 Mr. Chairman, are there any
22 questions about the information presented in
23 this graph?

24 MR. SAM: Questions?
25 Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: Are these funding
sources -- is there continuation for request
for additional funding or --

MR. SCHLEUSNER: For the
monitoring program, our projects that are
ending?

MR. REAKOFF: My question is:
Are these funding sources continued to be --
they go to Congress every year and ask for
more money?

MR. SCHLEUSNER: This is going to
be a continuous funding source. At the 2003
funding level, they will maintain that level
of funding.

MR. SAM: Any more questions?
Seeing none.
Go ahead.

MR. SCHLEUSNER: Funding requests

1 in 2002 exceeded available funding by
2 328,000, so not all funding requests could
3 be met. 11 preproposals were advanced for
4 approximately 741,000. Six of the projects
5 were stock status and trends projects asking
6 for approximately \$529,000 and five were
7 harvest monitoring and TEK projects
8 requesting \$275,000. Only 414,000 is
9 available for funding in 2002. The stock
10 status and trend project was 225,000 and the
11 harvest monitoring and TEK funding was
12 138,000.

13 Six projects were advanced under
14 the stock status and trends requesting the
15 529,000 with only 275,000 available for
16 funding in 2002.

17 Due to these funding constraints,
18 only three stock status and trends projects
19 were selected. The Delayed Mortality of
20 Tagged Fall Chum Salmon Project, No. 11, was
21 recommended by the TRC for funding. This
22 study will look at potential mortality in
23 fall chum salmon resulting from handling
24 stress at the Rampart-Rapids tagging
25 project. The implications of high mortality
rates associated with research projects and
fish wheels would have statewide
significance.

Project 97 and 121 were
recommended for funding by the TRC. Project
97, the sex ratios of juvenile and adult
chinook salmon will look at the possible
explanations for skewed sex ratios observed
in chinook salmon returning to tributaries
of the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers. Sex
ratios in salmon stocks are important in
setting biological escapement goals and the
management of salmon escapement.

Project 121, The Genetic
Diversity, Run Timing, and Migratory
Patterns of Chinook Salmon Stocks within the
Yukon River. This project is a
collaborative project involving the Alaska
Department of Fish & Game, Canadian DFO, and
the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Services genetics
labs. The technical review committee gave
this project the highest priority in the
Yukon. One objective of the study is to
establish a genetic baseline for chinook
salmon using DNA analysis for stock

1 discrimination. A second objective is to
2 genetically assess the chinook salmon at
3 Pilot Station using an existing allozyme
4 baseline to identify patterns of stock
5 composition and run timing.

6 Projects 9, 56, and 44 were
7 quality projects that were not selected due
8 to funding constraints. For Project 9, the
9 Technician Support for Pilot Station Sonar,
10 the TRC felt that alternative funding
11 sources like the Partnerships program were
12 more appropriate to fund staff positions.
13 Project 56, the North Fork Andreafsky River
14 Weir Project would provide additional
15 escapement data within the Andreafsky
16 drainage. TRC prioritized other information
17 needs in the program above this project
18 given the Fisheries resource Monitoring
19 Program is currently funding the East Fork
20 Andreafsky Weir Project. Project 44: This
21 project is a telemetry study of summer chum
22 in the Innoko River drainage. Again, the
23 TRC prioritized the program need for
24 baseline genetics work on chinook salmon for
25 this project. The TRC recommends that
alternative funding sources be explored or
that the proposals not selected be
resubmitted for the 2003 plan.

Four projects were advanced under
Harvest Monitoring and TEK. Requesting
\$212,000 with only \$138,000 available for
funding in 2002.

Due to the funding constraints,
only three Harvest Monitoring and TEK
Projects were recommended by the TRC.
Project 37 Harvest Monitoring and TEK of
Subsistence Non-Salmon Fish in the Lower
Yukon River was recommended for funding by
the TRC. This project addresses a regional
need for harvest monitoring and traditional
ecological knowledge in the GASH Region.
The information collected by this project
would compliment the GASH working group
Project 238, previously funded. The scope
of this project has been modified in
response to issues brought forward by the
GASH working group project. The proposed
project will collect additional information
on harvest and stock assessment of northern
pike in Federal waters. The addition of

1 this opportunistic sampling strengthens the
2 overall project and provides important
3 subsistence data supporting Alaska
4 Department of Fish & Game Sport Fish Innoko
5 River Northern Pike Assessment Project.

6 Project 6, Monitoring Subsistence
7 Harvest of Fishes from Old John Lake, Arctic
8 Village and Project 84, the review of oral
9 history tapes on the TEK Subsistence
10 Harvests and Fishes, Old John Lake and
11 surrounding water bodies were selected for
12 funding by the TRC. Both studies are
13 continuations of previously funded project,
14 Projects 3 and 11, requiring additional time
15 and funding to bring these projects to
16 completion.

17 Project 30, the Yukon River TEK
18 study was a high-quality project that was
19 not selected due to limited funding. The
20 TRC prioritized the work in progress and the
21 non-salmon harvest monitoring and TEK in the
22 GASH area projects over the information
23 needs of the Lower Yukon.

24 Again, the TRC recommends that
25 alternative funding sources be explored or
that the proposal be resubmitted for the
2003 plan.

The funding request for the three
Yukon harvest monitoring and TEK projects
selected totals 162,400; the three stock
status and trends projects recommended for
funding totaled \$251,200. The combined
funding request for the six projects
recommended by the TRC, totaled \$413,600
with target funding for 2002 set at
\$413,000.

Funding requests for
inter-regional projects in 2002 also
exceeded available funding by \$70,000, so
not all funding requests could be met.

Five proposals were advanced for
approximately 178,000. Three of them were
stock, status, and trends projects, asking
for \$136,000 and two harvest monitoring and
TEK projects 41,000.

Only five were available for
funding in 2002. The Stock, Status, and
Trends funding for interregional, was
71,000. The TEK funding for interregional
was \$35,000.

1 Three interregional projects were
2 advanced under Stock, Status, and Trends
3 requesting \$136,600 with only 70,000
4 available for funding in 2002.

5 Project 25, The Development of
6 General Methods for Calculation of
7 Sustainable Subsistence Harvests was
8 recommended for funding. The University of
9 Washington, University of Alaska-Fairbanks,
10 and the Alaska Department of Fish & Game are
11 proposing the development of a computer
12 program to analyze available data and
13 evaluate the long-term consequences of
14 different harvest policies. This project
15 meets a high priority need for the
16 protection of fish stocks for continued
17 subsistence use.

18 Project 69, The Development of a
19 Shared AYK Fishery Database was recommended
20 by the TRC for funding. This study is an
21 Alaska Department of Fish & Game proposal to
22 continue work started in Project 16. This
23 phase of work will focus on error-checking
24 historic data, standardizing data formats,
25 and development of standard data entry and
26 reporting formats.

27 Project 71 was a high-quality
28 project that was not selected due to limited
29 funding. This Alaska Department of Fish &
30 Game project proposed to conduct a
31 literature review of existing studies on
32 catch-and-release fishing and the
33 development of a database for this
34 information. A working group would then be
35 formed to review the information and develop
36 a management strategy for catch-and release
37 fishing in Western Interior Alaska. Again,
38 the TRC recommends that alternative funding
39 sources be explored or that the proposal be
40 resubmitted for the 2003 plan.

41 Two interregional projects were
42 advanced under the harvest monitoring and
43 TEK, requesting 41,500 with only 35,000
44 available for funding in 2002.

45 Due to the funding constraints,
46 only one harvest monitoring and TEK project
47 was selected. Project 43, the Alaska
48 Fisheries Database GIS Integration is an
49 Alaska Department of Fish & Game project
50 designed to link the current Alaska

1 Subsistence Fisheries database to the State
2 GIS system and improve access to this
3 information.

4 Project 47 was a high-quality
5 project that was not selected due to limited
6 funding.

7 The Alaska Department of Fish &
8 Game project would provide a subsistence
9 database on the Bristol Bay, Chignik
10 District, Cook Inlet, and Kuskokwim drainage
11 and graphically depict fisheries harvest
12 timing and promote daily reporting. Again,
13 the TRC recommends that alternative funding
14 sources be explored or that the proposal be
15 resubmitted for the 2003 plan.

16 To recap the 2002 Draft Fisheries
17 Resource Monitoring Plan, the TRC
18 recommended three stock, status, and trends
19 projects for funding. These projects would
20 build on the existing program. Project 11
21 will evaluate the impacts of the existing
22 tagging program at Ramparts-Rapids; Project
23 121 would develop a genetic baseline for
24 Yukon River chinook salmon, and Project 97
25 examines possible causes for the skewed sex
ratios reported in spawning chinook salmon
in the Yukon and Kuskokwim River drainages.

The TRC recommended three harvest
monitoring and TEK projects for funding in
2002. Project 37 builds on the existing
program by collecting subsistence harvest
information on northern pike and other
non-salmon fish species in the GASH Region.
This project will support ongoing work in an
Alaska Department of Fish & Game northern
pike study and Project 238, the GASH working
group. Projects 6 and 84 would complete the
ongoing studies on harvest monitoring and
TEK of Old John Lake.

The TRC recommended two
interregional stock, status, and trends
projects. Project 25 proposes to develop a
method for calculation of a -- for a
sustainable subsistence harvest and Project
69 continued the development of a shared AYK
fisheries database.

The TRC recommended one
interregional Harvest Monitoring and TEK
Project. Project 43 proposes to integrate
and link the current Alaska Subsistence

1 Fisheries Database to the State GIS system
and improve access to this information.

2 Mr. Chairman, again, I would like
3 to thank you for your attention through this
4 presentation and open it up for questions
and ask for recommendations on the draft
2002 Yukon River Fisheries Monitoring Plan
at this time.

5
6 MR. SAM: Cliff, were you looking
7 for a total commitment and prioritizing
right now or were you going to bring some of
this up to the regions?

8 MR. MATHEWS: Since these cover
9 the whole Yukon drainage specifically, all
three Councils need to look at it. Also,
10 what you need and I'll be handing it out,
is -- Cliff already covered this, but
11 basically earlier on in this process a
couple years ago, you developed a list of
12 information needs and et cetera, and I'll
pass that out. So, basically, what's going
13 on here is you need to look at your past
needs. You need to look at what they have
14 looked at, the technical review committee of
their four ranking factors of strategic
15 priorities, technical merit, past
performance, and administrative expertise
16 and partnership building and see if that
meets your -- also matches or meets your
information needs.

17 And it would be easiest, as we've
18 done in February and a year ago, two years
ago in January, would probably to take up
these as a block.

19 What I mean by a block is we
20 would take up the stock, status, and trends
section, is what I call it, and then look at
21 how you want -- what your recommendation
might be for those blocks of projects, and
22 then go forward to the block on traditional
environmental knowledge. And then I need to
23 consult with the staff there to how they
want to look at the inter-regional, but I
think they want that on a block too.

24 So, that would be it. So I can
25 pass out your past information and needs.
The second or third page of it is on the
Yukon, and the Kuskokwim for those that are

1 wondering is the next segment that's coming
2 up. We're not ignoring the Kuskokwim.
3 There seemed to be a little confusion
4 earlier on that. Right now we're talking
5 Yukon. The same process will go with that.

6 I'll pass out the information
7 needs. Does that make sense? You need to
8 look at your past, what you thought were
9 important. That program has gone out and
10 said these are the needs that the Council
11 has identified. We have submitted
12 proposals. They've gone through various
13 reviews and the final review is matching
14 those four factors of technical expertise
15 and strategic priorities.

16 That analysis is before you. Now
17 you have to decide, do you agree with that
18 analysis and recommendations?

19 MR. SAM: Jack, you had a
20 question?

21 While Jack is reading, I'll move
22 to Gerald.

23 MR. NICHOLIA: I have a serious
24 question about this proposal plan,
25 Interregional Investigative Plan, 02-035.
26 It's a concern about the investigator that's
27 going to be doing the investigating.
28 There's serious conflicts in there. They're
29 working for other region -- I wouldn't
30 want -- I wouldn't want this thing to be
31 funded if -- there's got to be somebody else
32 besides this doctor, whoever it is, Ray --
33 Dr. Hilborn. He has been working for some
34 other conflicting interests besides the
35 Yukon and Kuskokwim River. I don't think --
36 I don't think this would be right. If we're
37 going to set biological escapement goals
38 with somebody that's been on the ocean,
39 doesn't have no in-river experience, I don't
40 think this project should be even funded or
41 considered at this time.

42 MR. SAM: I think, Gerald, I want
43 to look at that paper. I don't have it in
44 front of me.

45 Jack, then Mary Gregory.

46 MR. JACOBSEN: I would like to

1 know where the TRC's list is. Is it in our
2 booklet here, the stuff you had on the
overhead there? Is that in our packet here?

3 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Right. Mr.
4 Chairman, the tables are provided booklets.
Let me give you the references for those.
5 The interregional is on page 54,
Tab D.

6 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, if we
7 can -- you know, go with the interregional
and work back, so we know, staff, if that's
8 the direction you want. Because there's
several tables dealing with other sections
9 that you need to focus in on. So, when, I
think you get through this question phase,
10 please indicate which block of projects you
want to look at.

11 MR. SAM: Mary, you have a
12 question?

13 MS. GREGORY: I have a comment on
there, 71, Scientific Studies Relating to
14 the Practice of Catch-and-Release Fishing in
Western and Interior Alaska. I would like
15 to have seen this project funded because
every time I ask somebody about sport
16 fishing and how much they're catching and
releasing and I have a concern about this
17 data being released. At one time I was told
only 8 percent don't survive, and I need it
18 in black and white to satisfy my -- my
questions.

19 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
this project was actually recommended by the
20 North Slope Regional Advisory Council to be
funded. The question comes with this
21 recommendation for funding with -- given the
fact that there's limited funding, would you
22 recommend one of the other projects not be
funded? That was the hard decision they had
23 to make. This was an interesting proposal
in that it reviewed the current literature
24 on the catch-and-release fishing, and it was
looking to see how applicable that
25 literature, since not much research has been
done on this in the Interior Alaska, how

1 applicable that research would be in the
2 management of a catch-and-release strategy
for Western Interior.

3 MS. GREGORY: Mr. Chairman, I
4 would like to see some sort of funding
5 developed for this because if you -- if the
6 study proves something that we can know that
7 the activities of the fish after being up --
their life upset for a while, and then -- my
8 concern is that a lot of fish are in the
bottom of some rivers after -- after influx
of sport fishing, and that happens. That's
a fact.

9 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
10 Ms. Gregory, this actually is not proposing
11 to do any field work. It's just reviewing
12 the literature -- studies that are
13 already -- already have been done. Most of
the studies and the work has been done in
the Lower 48 states and Canada, so they will
be just comparing the literature that's
available right now, not actually doing any
work on the ground.

14 MS. GREGORY: Then I guess, if
15 it's just reviewing of literature, I think
16 people who work in the departments can find
time to do it on their own than have to be
funded. It could be part of their work.

17 MR. SAM: John Hanson?

18 MR. HANSON: Thank you, Mr.
19 Chairman, okay. Your investigation plan,
20 Map 1 -- on page 11, you have all these
21 projects and 121, the bottom portion of it
22 has a run timing, migratory pattern and
23 harvest information of chinook. Each year
24 you always take the harvest information. On
the migratory pattern, I think Fish &
Wildlife is working just exactly as
Department of Fish & Game. Fish & Game
have -- even Rich knows, he was on Fish &
Game for I don't know how many years.

25 All they do is just look at the
Yukon or Kuskokwim. They've got all the
information on the Yukon, all the
information on the Kuskokwim on the

1 migration pattern, and they don't even
2 mention the ocean. Like Carl said earlier,
3 let's get something done out there before we
4 look at the little rivers.

5 So this migration pattern here
6 should -- it's not going to help you guys
7 inside the river. By now you know what's
8 going on in the river. The less fish you
9 get, the more money you're going to spend.
10 So, take that money out there, get to the
11 migration pattern, and find out which way
12 those fish are going.

13 The three council Chairs in
14 January -- February wrote a letter on the
15 migration pattern for AYK, Bristol Bay, AYK,
16 Norton Sound, and I think instead of
17 following the Department of Fish & Game, I
18 think you guys should just do your thing,
19 get the migration pattern all straightened
20 out before you come into a small river.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. SAM: Jack Reakoff, and then
23 we're going to go for a ten-minute break.

24 MR. REAKOFF: I would like to see
25 this catch-and-release data accumulated. I
would like to see all their funding source
sought or whatever it would take because
that's becoming a very big issue. This
catch-and-release is becoming more and more.
They're getting big money for these trips
and there are people catching and releasing
hundreds and hundreds of fish and the
mortalities are getting higher and higher as
those trip costs get higher, it accommodates
more and more use, and the resource -- what
we have to know is what the resource can
endure, and it's sort of a wasteful
endurance.

26 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
27 I'd like to address Mr. Hanson's comments,
28 and then I'll address Jack's.

29 I think the title on that project
30 is a little misleading. Project 121 is
31 actually proposing to develop a genetic
32 baseline for the chinook salmon in the Yukon
33 River, and that would be directly applicable
34 to determining whether the fish caught out

1 in the open ocean is originally from the
2 Yukon River, so, with that genetic baseline,
3 you can take samples from by-catch in the
4 ocean and determine the origin of the fish
5 whether or not it's a Yukon fish, a
6 Kuskokwim River fish or so on. So, it's
7 actually taking a different approach, and
8 different technology for managers to look at
9 these same run timing, migratory patterns,
10 and also potentially by-catch in the open
11 sea.

12 MR. SAM: Go ahead, Rich.

13 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, I just
14 wanted to follow up too on what Cliff is
15 explaining on the stock biology studies.
16 Cliff is right. You need baseline
17 information in order to make these genetic
18 tools work for you, and there's an effort by
19 all of the laboratories, genetics
20 laboratories in Alaska, National Marine
21 Fisheries Service, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife
22 Service, and the Alaska Department of Fish &
23 Game genetics laboratories are trying to
24 work together in here in Alaska to develop
25 those baselines so that you can make those
determinations of where stocks are being
caught throughout their migration pathway.

The thing is, it's not an easy
thing to do when you have many, many stocks
out in the open ocean. It gets to be very
complicated, and those kind of projects
where the sampling is done, for example, out
in the Shumagins or Unimak area, those kind
of studies have been done and the reports
have been given to the Board of Fisheries
and others in the past.

Now a proposal did become -- come
before this program to do some sampling like
that out in the area M area, but the
Council, when they looked at that decided
that that really was moving outside of their
jurisdiction for the Federal subsistence
program.

Now, the Department of Fish &
Game or other groups could do that work or
the National Marine Services could do that
work, collecting the samples in another
area, marine environment.

1 Now, the baseline work, though,
2 is going to help everybody, helps everybody
3 to do a better job of trying to separate out
4 the stocks. It's not that people don't want
5 to know this, it's just that it's very hard
6 to do. It gets to be very complicated to
7 separate the stocks out when you have so
8 many from Asia and from other parts of
9 Alaska all mixing in the same area.

10 MR. SAM: Cliff, you had an
11 answer for Jack?

12 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
13 Mr. Reakoff, the 177 project, as I
14 understand it, is an important -- very
15 important project and it does address a very
16 important issue. I just wanted
17 clarification, again, if we are to go
18 forward with the recommendations from the
19 Council to fund this project, will the
20 Council be willing to make recommendations
21 on not funding one of the other projects?

22 MR. SAM: Jack?

23 MR. REAKOFF: The other projects
24 are very worthwhile, and the technical
25 review committee made some very in-depth
26 considerations, but I do feel that alternate
27 funding sources should be sought for that
28 study. I've been talking to sport fish
29 division for Alaska Department of Fish &
30 Game on this issue, and these types of loss
31 mortalities, whether they're through
32 terrestrial voices -- loss with terrestrial
33 animals and the catch-and-release
34 mortalities, they're becoming more and more
35 of an issue with this Council. We have loss
36 issues where I'm at, and we have these
37 catch-and-release issue mortality issues.
38 This all affects the resource that
39 subsistence users depend on, and I feel that
40 an alternate funding source should be sought
41 and should be prioritized as highly for an
42 alternate funding source.

43 And this is going to be a
44 continuing issue as more and more people use
45 the resource.

1 MR. SAM: Okay, Vince. Then
2 shortly a quick one, then we'll go on a
3 break. It's our understanding, we come in
here and more or less prioritize these
inter-regional funding projects, right?

4 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, that's what I
5 was going to ask is when you do on great --
6 I'm going to ask the coordinators and the
7 two principal presenters and the three
8 Chairs that we meet for three minutes. We
9 need to set up a structure of how to address
10 these projects. We're bouncing all over the
11 place with questions, which is great; but we
12 need to get focus of how to get to your
recommendations; so, during break if the
coordinators and Cliff and Rich and the
three Chairs, we could meet real quickly,
because we need to incorporate the public
comments and a couple other features of this
process, and I think real quickly we can lay
that out, when we come back from break, lay
it out for you, and start working on that.

And other Council members can sit
in on that too, but basically I need the
Chairs and the coordinators and the
principal on, so we can get a process
together so we can address all these
concerns.

16 MR. SAM: Vince, come up here and
17 meet with us while you're meeting here. At
18 this time, the Chair will call for a
15-minute break.

Thank you.

(Break.)

20 MR. SAM: I'd like to call the
meeting back to order.

21 We are looking at attempting to
22 prioritize ongoing projects, research,
everything.

At this time, I would also like
23 to ask that Council members to bear with us,
24 because a lot of the stuff that we're going
through now, what we went through yesterday,
was designed that way. It was designed so
25 that we hear the reports only one time, then
when we break out into our own Council

1 deliberations, we don't have to deal with
2 all these lengthy subjects. We try to do as
3 much as we can within the three Councils.

 So, Vince could start us out?

4 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. During break
5 we met, and what we're looking at here is a
6 process that we're going to take up blocks
7 of the projects; so, I encourage the
8 Regional Councils and others to turn to page
9 17 under Tab D, and then I'll walk you
10 through the process using that, and then
11 we'll actually do it.

 It's kind of like you're back in
12 school. You can't go until I say go.

 I apologize for that, but it's a
13 large audience, and I want to make sure that
14 everybody can track along.

15 Okay, if you're at page 17, you
16 will see the projects --

17 MR. SAM: Vince?

18 MR. NICHOLIA: I think it starts
19 on page 15.

20 MR. MATHEWS: Okay. I'm sorry,
21 thanks, you're right. Thanks, Gerald.

22 We'll start on page 15, sorry.
23 If you look at that, these are all the
24 projects that deal with stock, status, and
25 trends. I'll try to keep staff away from
26 acronyms, but those are the SST-type
27 projects. If you look at that table on page
28 15, you will see projects that are bold,
29 dark black colors. Those are the ones that
30 the technical review committee, after people
31 submitted proposals based on your needs and
32 they looked at their criteria of strategic
33 priority and feasibility and et cetera; that
34 review committee said those bold projects
35 should go forward.

 Okay. Now, the next step in the
36 process would be -- Cliff or whoever is
37 appropriate would not summarize the project,
38 but would bring up the project by title and
39 name, and maybe a little description if
40 needed. Then we would ask if there's any
41 Council questions about that project.

 People could ask: What is this

1 all about?

2 Then at the end of that phase of
3 questions from Regional Councils, we would
4 ask if there's any public testimony, people
5 want to come up and say what they feel about
6 that project.

7 Okay. And then we would go to
8 the next project that's in bold. And then
9 the third project that's in bold.

10 When we've completed all three of
11 those, we would ask if there's any questions
12 about those that were not funded. They're
13 not dark black.

14 And then I will try and stay in
15 tune with this and ask if there's a
16 consensus on that block of projects.

17 If there is, then we note that on
18 the record, and then we move to page 17 on
19 the -- let's just call them the "traditional
20 knowledge proposals."

21 Okay. We're going to build these
22 by blocks and we'll advise you along the
23 way, and that's the process that we would
24 use.

25 Is that acceptable to the full
Council? You have opportunity when the
project is brought up to ask questions,
clarifications, whatever you want, and then
we walk through them. The ones that also
didn't get funding -- you could ask
questions on those if you'd like. Then
we'll go to a block voting, consensus on
those. If there's not consensus, which we
met Monday night, all the officers, then
we'll vote by regions.

On this type of recommendation
phase, it would be best to strive toward
consensus, if at all possible.

Okay. That's the process if
everyone will accept that.

I'll turn that over to Cliff. We
have chairs up there if there's more than
one person that wants to testify. For those
who want to testify when we get to that
phase, please give your name, if you're
associated with an organization so it's
clear to us and on the record who is
speaking and who they may be speaking for.

Thank you.

1 MR. SAM: Cliff?

2 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
3 we'll start with the stock, status, and
4 trends projects. There are six projects
5 advanced. The first project is the
6 "Technician Support for the Pilot Station
7 Sonar," Project 02-009. I'll be glad to
8 answer any questions about this project at
9 this time.

10 MR. SAM: Check. Would it be
11 okay if we come back? It's hard dealing
12 with three Councils.

13 Vince, do you want to go through
14 it one line -- line-item by line-item, come
15 back if we have to. That's a possibility.

16 MR. MATHEWS: Yes. We can do it
17 item by item. What we were just trying to
18 do -- if there was anyone here that wanted
19 to testify to get your approval to get that
20 one funded, that they have opportunity to
21 express their concern.

22 So, we were looking line-item by
23 line-item just so you have the opportunity
24 and we can stay organized on your concerns
25 and questions on those as well as testimony.

26 Are we on the same wavelength,
27 Ron?

28 MR. SAM: I think.
29 Any questions or comments on
30 02-009?

31 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.:
32 Mr. Chairman, I think this proposal, here,
33 02-009, it's very important, the people on
34 the station sonar. I think it's very
35 important for the whole Yukon.

36 MR. MATHEWS: Okay.
37 The next part of that would be,
38 is there any other Council members, but are
39 there people here in attendance that would
40 like to comment on the proposed -- on the
41 project -- Pilot Station sonar?

42 MR. NICHOLIA: Is there anyone
43 back there? Jennifer?

1
2 MR. SAM: There is an empty seat
3 by Rich Cannon; so, for the record, please
4 state your name, organization, and all that.

5 MS. HOOPER: Thank you, Mr.
6 Chairman. My name is Jennifer Hooper. I'm
7 the Director of Natural Resources for AVCP.
8 I'm also the investigator on this proposal.
9 I guess just to briefly explain
10 the proposal; it's to provide funding to
11 hire a local person from Pilot Station as a
12 fishery assistant to assist the Fish & Game
13 in operations of the sonar. And this is my
14 first time before any of you Council
15 members, so I'm not quite sure of the proper
16 protocol.

17 But I guess just -- I might be
18 missing something, but maybe I could get a
19 little clarification. According to the SST
20 proposals, according to the Table 3 on page
21 15 of the three projects that were
22 recommended for funding, it would leave
23 23,800 from the target budget level, and
24 there's also the same situation with the
25 harvest monitoring TEK projects. There's a
26 little extra. Maybe I'm missing something
27 and I don't know where those extra funds go
28 to, but I do believe it's an important
29 project. It helps with capacity-building
30 for the local community. We've had the same
31 technician come back the last two years, and
32 I think his being involved with this project
33 is benefiting himself, making himself more
34 valuable with the knowledge he's getting
35 from the project. And if there is funding
36 left over, I don't want to say this project
37 is more important than the others, but I
38 guess if there is funding left over, I would
39 encourage you to pass this forward.

40 Thank you.

41 MR. SAM: Yeah, thank you,
42 Jennifer. We have done that in the past
43 because -- so, it will be considered.
44 I don't know how or when we do it
45 right now.

46 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
47 Jennifer. Actually, the table on page 17 is

1 incorrect. The project 02-037 should be
2 90,000, not 60.1. That additional money for
3 the stock, status, and trends was being used
4 to cover that particular project, and the
5 addition of the pike -- collection of pike
6 harvest assessment data.

7 Just to reiterate the rationale
8 of the TRC on this proposal, the TRC agreed
9 that this is a very important project and it
10 has a great capacity-building component, but
11 they just thought that maybe another funding
12 mechanism like the Partners Program would be
13 more appropriate than our resource
14 monitoring funds for hiring a technician, a
15 staff member for a project.

16 There is also concern raised by
17 the TRC for two years that were funded.

18 The TRC recommended that
19 capacity-building component of this project
20 be developed and a curricula written down so
21 that we could guarantee that this technician
22 actually was advancing and had career
23 opportunities through this program, and that
24 was never addressed for the TRC.

25 So, there was concerns about that
part of this project. But the TRC did
recognize the importance of this project and
was recommending that they use an
alternative mechanism for funding, like
applying through the Partners Program.

MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.:
Mr. Chairman?

MR. SAM: Harry?

MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Rich, is
this Pilot Station sonar also funded from
RNA?

MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, Harry,
this particular money for the Pilot Station
technician has been funded in the past from
the In-Sea Fishermen's Association funds and
other funds. It's been something that's
been going on for some time. I know the
Department of Fish & Game -- I can't speak
for them now. At least I could when I was
working for them. I'm sure -- it is now, it
was a valuable thing to have that person

1 working on the project, to help build
2 relationships and help work with some
3 employment for someone. It can be funded
4 out of other sources of funds.

5 It doesn't have to be just this
6 source. I don't know if there are other --
7 if Jennifer has looked at that for other
8 sources of funds yet or not, if it could be
9 RNA or some other possible source. I don't
10 know. Jennifer could probably tell us if
11 she has.

12 MS. HOOPER: Yeah, it sounds like
13 there's some confusion. There's been
14 confusion in the past on how many
15 technicians we have funded for Pilot
16 Station, and we have two. Our first
17 technician we've had for before I came to
18 AVCP is funded through BSFA. His time is a
19 lot more limited due to funding than this
20 particular technician. Our funding from
21 BSFA has gone down incrementally since the
22 last few years that I've been involved.
23 When the OSM project proposal started a
24 couple years ago, that's when we found the
25 need by Fish & Game for assistance and
26 decided to put forth proposals to fund a
27 position. Every year we get support from
28 the local Fish & Game project operation
29 leader, currently Carl Pfisterer, and so
30 this is an additional position aside from
31 the one we get from BSFA. And I hope that's
32 clarified, because there's been confusion in
33 my doing proposals for this position.
34 People thought you already have it funded
35 through one source, but there is actually
36 two positions locally hired, and this is the
37 second.

38 And regarding the RA fund, we had
39 operated the Marshall Test Fishery a couple
40 years ago, and we asked them to look for
41 other sources of funding, so we came to OSM
42 to fund that project, which was funded the
43 last two years, not including this one.

44 So, I'd have to go back and
45 really brainstorm where else I could get
46 funding for this technician.

47 MR. SAM: Thanks, Jennifer.
48 What's bothering right now, are

1 you looking for an answer right now, because
2 I do not see any -- any way, form, or
3 whatnot, that we could act on this unless we
4 hear the other proposals.

5 Vince?

6 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I'd
7 like to ask a question of Jennifer that
8 might help. It's not clear to me -- have
9 you submitted a proposal to the Partnership,
10 because the way I understand the Technical
11 Review Committee, they were hoping this
12 important position would be, I suppose,
13 funded through that Partnership Program,
14 which is more of a career development
15 process. So, it might help the Council to
16 know -- Councils, excuse me, if you
17 submitted that and the due date for that is
18 November 10th?

19 MS. HOOPER: It's my
20 understanding that the Partnership Program
21 is to hire biologists and anthropologists,
22 and those are fairly more upscale than a
23 technician position. We are, in fact
24 looking with some of the other nonprofits
25 along both rivers to look at possible
26 cooperative proposals for that. But I was
27 aware that these were for more professional,
28 more degree-based positions.

29 MR. SAM: Jack?

30 MR. REAKOFF: It would be my
31 suggestion that the joint Councils recommend
32 that this technician support position be
33 advanced into the Partnership Program for
34 funding, and for that level of technician
35 instead of a professional biologist for this
36 level of technician that we feel that this
37 is a worthwhile project, but not -- should
38 not be used from our monitoring funding, but
39 that the Partnership Program will fund
40 this -- this level of technician. Can --

41 MR. KLEIN: Steve Klein with the
42 Office of Subsistence Management and for the
43 Partners Program. One component of it is an
44 internship program, and this could possibly
45 fit in terms of an -- in terms of a summer

1 intern position. However, we really don't
2 have control over who is awarded the
3 Partners' positions or what they do for
4 those internships. So, we can't say that we
5 would fund this under Partners, although
6 that's an option for the organizations that
7 get the Partner positions.

8 I'd like to bring up another
9 concern of the TRC, and that was statewide.
10 We're funding about 100 projects, and
11 there's -- for each project there's hundreds
12 of technicians, and for each project we have
13 requests to fund those positions separately
14 from the project, that could use up all the
15 money to hire -- to hire technicians. And
16 the TRC, one of their concerns was that
17 whoever is conducting these projects, they
18 need the technicians, they ought to try to
19 support that. In this case, it ought to be
20 the Alaska Department of Fish & Game. On
21 that Kwethluk weir, they have operations,
22 they fund the technicians, TRC, we wanted to
23 have the investigators for those projects
24 fund the technicians if they need to run the
25 projects.

14 MR. SAM: Does that answer your
15 question?

16 MR. REAKOFF: So, you're saying
17 that this is Alaska Department of Fish &
18 Game project and they should fund this
19 position themselves?

18 MR. KLEIN: For the TRC, yes,
19 that was one of the recommendations.

20 This could get so big for all the
21 different projects, that we really ought to
22 look at the main investigator to fund these
23 positions; and I think with today's -- today
24 we ought to -- every project should have a
25 partnership-building component. We ought to
be using local hires wherever possible. We
ought to be doing local contracts that's all
organizations. We need to work together.
The days of operating in a vacuum and one
agency just doing their thing without
involvement of locals, I think we need to
get away from that, and that's the signal
we're trying to send.

1 Mr. Chair?

2 MR. SAM: Thank you. And it
3 would behoove all of us to go through that
4 MOA agreement with -- between the State and
5 Feds with a fine-tooth comb and start
6 pushing these issues then. Is that what
7 we're trying to say?

8 MR. KLEIN: Exactly, Mr. Chair.

9 MR. SAM: Thank you.
10 Where do we go from here?

11 MR. MATHEWS: I think your
12 suggestion earlier would be wise that we go
13 through the next project.

14 We'll be back trying to sort
15 these out, but I think you need to go to the
16 next project down the list, and then at the
17 end we'll try to see what we can come
18 together on this.

19 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chair. The
20 next project, if you're following along in
21 your books is 02-011, the "Delayed Mortality
22 of Tagged Fall Chum Salmon." I'll be happy
23 to answer any questions about this project
24 or hear testimony at this time.

25 MR. SAM: Jack?

26 MR. REAKOFF: The main objective
27 is to find out how many fish died from
28 tagging. How would that be determined in a
29 nutshell? I mean, you would pen the ones
30 after you tagged them or --

31 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Basically this
32 project is funding additional recapture
33 wheels in Beaver and Circle, so that they're
34 looking at the percentage or the ratio of
35 tagged fish versus untagged fish as they
36 progress in the migration to Canada. This
37 is funding additional recapture wheels as
38 they progressed through distance on the
39 river.

40 MR. SAM: Any further questions
41 for Cliff or Richard?

1 Gerald?

2 MR. NICHOLIA: This project here
3 is the same one that's going on in the
4 Rapids with Stan Zuray -- what Stan told me
5 about this project is that the delayed
6 mortality, the longer they are in the water,
7 the more or less they're going to make it
8 up. Another thing about that too, it
9 doesn't matter how fish-friendly the
10 fishwheel is either. It could just be
11 regular, beat them up fish basket, you
12 couldn't tell no difference in that.

The delayed mortality, if we're
knocking off all these other projects along
these other places, about mortality, want to
see how much fish that dies, that don't make
it. I just don't see where TRC is finding
so important to tell me how they find it so
important like this other project, where
they could find out how much more fish is
going up the river and said how much more
fish is dying.

13 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
14 the TRC rated this project as a high
15 priority because they were -- they were
16 initially estimating mortality rates in
17 excess of 75 percent with fall chum being a
18 species and stock of concern in the Yukon.
19 If the projects to collect the information
20 are potentially killing thousands of fish,
21 information was pretty important and deemed
22 very important to find this out.

MR. SAM: Any further questions
for Rich and Cliff?
Vince?

MR. MATHEWS: Now, you would see
if there was anybody wanting to testify or
share information about this project -- from
the audience.

MR. SAM: I see a couple of hands
raised. Use the mike right next to Rich
Cannon and state your name and agency.

MR. ADAMS: My name is Jeff
Adams. I'm the acting project leader at the

1 Fairbanks Fisheries office at Fish &
2 Wildlife office. We conduct this project.
3 The issue here, I guess, is that we have a
4 marking wheel at Rapids which is part of
5 Stan's operation, then we have a recapture
6 wheel, a contracted wheel at Rampart, and we
7 use a marker capture ratio to come up with
8 an estimate of number of fall chum that's by
9 those areas. With that number and the
10 number at Pilot Station, the managers exam
11 come up with number that go up the mainstem
12 Yukon and then the numbers that go into
13 Tanana drainage, so Fish & Game and Fish &
14 Wildlife Service are very supportive of that
15 marker capture project. Without that, it
16 makes it very difficult to determine how
17 much fish will make it up the mainstem and
18 on to Canada. What this project is about or
19 based on some history, there's -- appears to
20 be a higher mortality of fish that are
21 marked and recaptured than with the unmarked
22 fish. So, with these two additional
23 fishwheels at Beaver and Circle, we're able
24 to determine if the marking -- if the marker
25 capture project, which is so important to
management, if that project is actually
having a negative effect on the fish that we
release. The wheels at Beaver and Circle
are also contracted with the ones at Rapids
and Rampart. So those projects inject quite
a bit of money into the economy also.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17
18 MR. SAM: Gerald?

19 MR. NICHOLIA: How are you going
20 to do this, though? Is this
catch-and-release, the fishwheel in Rampart,
is this catching and releasing them?

21 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman,
22 Mr. Nicholia. Yes, that's correct, at
23 Rampart the fish are captured and then the
24 fishwheel operator keeps track of the number
25 of unmarked fish that he catches and tagged
fish that he catches over a period of time.
The fishwheel operators at Beaver and Circle
do the same thing. The data are submitted
to the office --

1 MR. NICHOLIA: Is this fish that
2 are being caught -- those tagged fish being
3 released again?

4 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chair, depending
5 on the subsistence fishing periods, some of
6 them are -- the fishwheel operator is able
7 to actually harvest them as a subsistence
8 user. If he's operating the fishwheel
9 during those times, he keeps the fish. If
10 he's not, then he releases them.

11 MR. NICHOLIA: With that thing in
12 there, when he keeps the fish how are you
13 going to know, if the other ones are going
14 to know, how are you going to know what's
15 mortality and what's not mortality?

16 MR. ADAMS: It's based on the
17 ratio. Rampart, as an example, for every
18 ten fish that he catches, maybe two of them
19 would be marked; and then up at Beaver, up
20 to the next fishwheel, maybe out of every
21 ten fish that are captured only one is
22 marked. If that's the case, it looks like
23 there's an effect from the marking because
24 the ratio, the first -- the one at Rampart
25 was catching two of ten fish were marked;
26 the one at Beaver was one of ten, would you
27 expect if there was no mortality, you would
28 expect that number to stay consistent all
29 the way up the river, even in Canada if the
30 marking did have an effect. If those
31 numbers changed, then the marking probably
32 does have an effect. If they stay the same,
33 the project is not having an effect on the
34 population.

35 MR. NICHOLIA: How long is this
36 project going to last? Like two or three
37 years? One year?

38 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chair, I'm
39 relatively new to the Fairbanks office. I
40 believe this is the second year, the second
41 year that it's been operating Beaver and
42 Circle fishwheels. I believe this proposal
43 is for another two years.

44 MR. SCHLEUSNER: One year.

1

MR. ADAMS: So we're hoping the data from this year will help us determine whether this project is actually getting us the information we want and if there is an effect on this marker capture. If we have the project from next year, that will help confirm what we find out next year.

5

MR. NICHOLIA: I'd sure like to have it noted in there that this would be an ongoing project. I don't see that in here. That's all I have.

8

MR. SAM: Yeah, Benedict first.

9

MR. JONES: On your tagging, you keep a record of how many tagged and sex ratio and all that?

10

11

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Chair, Mr. Jones. Yes, we do keep records at both the tagging sight at Rapids and then the recapture site at Rampart. Records and lengths of the fish, general condition factor if the fish are in good shape or if they have a little bit of fungus on them, if they're bright fish, a little bit darker, try to keep all of those sort of associated data, so we're able to tell, when we recapture a fish, what that fish looked like when we caught it the first time versus what it may look like when we catch it the second time.

17

18

MR. JONES: What I'm asking, the sex ratio of the female and male fish there, how much percentage if you tag them?

19

20

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Jones, yes, we do keep track of the sex ratio.

21

22

MR. SAM: Jack?

23

MR. REAKOFF: Is part of this project to evaluate using a different type of tag that would have lower mortalities or that's the least intrusive tags that you found so far that you're using currently?

24

25

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Reakoff, the tag

1 that we use there are called spaghetti tags.
2 If anyone has seen them, kind of like a
3 rubber band, with numbers stencilled on
4 them. It's a pretty well accepted tag for
5 working with salmon, and I understand your
6 concerns with different tagging options.
7 Part of the reason we chose to stay with the
8 spaghetti tag is we've -- historically we've
9 done the background information to determine
10 what sort of tag loss is involved, if these
11 tags do have different effects on the fish.
12 So, we'd like to get a feel for this
13 mortality with these two other fishwheels
14 upstream, and then perhaps take a look and
15 see maybe the tag is what's having the
16 effect on the mortality, if that is what's
17 happening.

18 The problem, if we use a
19 different type of tag, we have to go through
20 the background information again to
21 determine if applying these tags may have
22 more of an effect on the fish than what the
23 current tags we're using. Until we get this
24 part figured out, we won't be changing the
25 tags in the short term.

1 MR. SAM: Carl Morgan?

2 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, you said this
3 is a high priority for this study, because
4 you said the mortality rate at this point is
5 70 percent. So you've already got that
6 study, right?

7 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Morgan, maybe
8 Cliff has better information. I'm kind of
9 new to this -- to the project.

10 MR. SCHLEUSNER: They were
11 estimating mortality rates based on the
12 ratios. They weren't confirmed. They're
13 trying to confirm those now. To speak about
14 Mr. Reakoff's concerns, one of the
15 objectives-study is to look at the effects
16 of holding times. They suspect that the
17 amount of time the fish spent in the
18 fishwheel is directly related to the
19 mortality upstream. So they're actually
20 comparing holding fish at different amounts
21 of time and seeing what effect that has on

1 the recapture rates upstream.

2 MR. MORGAN: So this money that
3 you're asking for is to reconfirm what you
kind of know, your best-guess estimate?

4 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, Carl,
5 this tagging project is not the first --
6 we've been doing tagging of salmon in many
7 areas of Alaska, it's been done all over the
8 Pacific Northwest in a similar manner. And
9 the thing about this study is that this is
10 something new. People have not seen this
11 before, where it appears, we say appears,
12 that there may be a higher mortality when
these fish are tagged and they have a long
migration. These fish are migrating a very
long way compared to most salmon in Alaska
or throughout their range. And one of the
things that biologists are trying to do is
make sure that we're not harming the fish.
We're trying to help the fish; not harm
them.

13 So, when this started showing up,
14 some of these skewed ratios, that was a
15 concern, and so people began to look for the
reasons why this may be occurring, and so we
don't know the answer for this definitely,
yet.

16 There could be a problem with
17 the -- sometimes the tags fall off the fish,
18 and that could effect this. So, they do
19 double marking. So there are questions
20 about that.

21 We've having this reviewed by
22 other biologists. We want to do this study
23 so we're going to be very carefully
24 controlling things so that we can make a
25 more definitive, more certain statement
about really what is the problem here.
That's why it's such a high priority to us.

26 MR. SAM: Any further questions?
27 Any further public testimony or
28 questions?

29 The Chair recognizes Greg
30 Roczicka.

31 MR. ROCZICKA: My name is Greg
32 Roczicka. I'm from the Natural Resources

1 Council, Bethel. I'd like to offer the
2 opinion that we highly recommend that you do
3 support this proposal. When I first was
4 made aware of this it about blew me off the
5 chair. We have stress-induced mortality as
6 a concern in a lot of different areas where
7 fish are affected by human handling of one
8 sort or another, or just human activities,
9 if you will, as reflected in the Quinhagak's
10 resolutions to you the other day. In this
11 instance, you know, the level of concern is
12 much greater. We're dealing with people
13 here who are trained individuals at the
14 least, and professional biologists at best,
15 and are going to be handling those fish in
16 the -- you know, least possible adverse
17 manner that you could hope for. And if
18 you're seeing that level of mortality, 57
19 percent in those circumstances, what you
20 might look at is almost a hospital setting.
21 They're trying to be real careful not to
22 harm the fish. It brings to mind the very
23 basic question that we have, anything we can
24 do to clear this up and see how it might
25 apply with other instances of just what the
buzz-word being used is stressing the
mortality. I highly support -- encourage
you to support this proposal.

15 MR. SAM: Thank you, Greg.
16 Fritz? Fritz, before you go, are
17 you doing the same study on the ones with
the sonar, the radio one -- the radios too?

18 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, Ron,
19 these same kinds of concerns are being
20 looked at in the information that they
21 collect at all the tagging studies on the
22 Yukon, so people are looking at the
23 condition of the fish.

24 Where the -- we -- like I said,
25 we haven't seen this in other studies that
we've worked on in other areas over the
Yukon to this degree. That's why we're
giving this one special attention. And as
Greg said, you know, we're trying to look at
the way the fish are handled. I can tell
you, I've been to the project. In this
case, these fish are handled very, very
carefully. They're trying to do everything

1 at that project to minimize stress, but
2 we're still having this question come up.
3 So, that's why we're going to want -- we
4 need to focus now. We can't just start, you
5 know, making assumptions by all projects.
6 We need to focus with a very clear study
7 design to look at this problem. We don't
8 panic people, we can't ignore it either. We
9 need to really focus on getting the answer
10 here. That's what this study is trying to
11 do.

12 MR. SAM: Thank you, Rich.
13 Fritz?

14 MR. GEORGE: Thank you, Mr.
15 Chairman. Looking at the mortality rate of
16 tagged salmon in these studies, something
17 like that seems like it don't need to happen
18 if there is some clear rivers where you can
19 see the bottom, counting in other fish
20 weirs. Like seems like they survive better
21 out in the ocean, and we were catching
22 tagged salmon, they were tagging the -- on
23 the Shumagin, in the Kuskokwim.

24 MR. SAM: Greg?

25 MR. ROCZICKA: If you recall, one
of the criticisms of the infamous study is
so few showed up. If there is such a huge
mortality rate from tagging fish, granted,
they don't know if they're more susceptible
in certain portions of the run or not, that
casts an even bigger question, Fritz, time
and again, to carry on.

MR. SAM: Rich?

MR. CANNON: I want to make this
point real clear is that the -- this is not
a real simple problem where every time a
fish is handled you make the assumption that
it is going to have a higher mortality.
It's how it's handled, the condition of the
fish, the environmental conditions the fish
may be facing. It's a complex thing.
That's why it's important to -- certainly
can't ignore this. We need to look at it,
but we need to do it so that we can control

1 some of the variables to say something for
2 certain about what is really affecting this
3 fish. That's why this kind of a study is
4 valuable. It can have implications in other
5 areas of the State, with other studies as
6 well in terms of how you do the work.

7 It's an important study.

8 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.:
9 Mr. Chairman?

10 MR. SAM: Harry, and then I'd
11 just like to say the perspective from Vince,
12 are we spending too much time on this one
13 proposal?

14 MR. MATHEWS: No, Mr. Chairman,
15 you're not, because of the fact that you're
16 discussing the importance of it and you're
17 comparing it to other projects, I would not
18 be concerned of time this moment because of
19 the importance expressed by the three
20 Councils on this project. I want to caution
21 the full Council that this is your meeting;
22 this is your time. So, whatever I've put on
23 the agenda or whatever is on the agenda on
24 time is best, I guess. So whatever you need
25 to address to get a good recommendation is
26 what you should be looking at.

27 So, I think you're doing fine on
28 this. You have representatives from various
29 organizations coming up here to share their
30 expertise on this. I'll just stop there. I
31 wouldn't be concerned on time yet.

32 MR. SAM: Okay. Thank you,
33 Vince.

34 Again, I would like to remind all
35 Council members of the protocol like we
36 discussed in our get-together. Again, I
37 would like to stress the important answer
38 that -- our Council members place on getting
39 the answer before we go home because there's
40 so many times that we don't spend enough
41 time gathering public testimony and
42 information.

43 On the ways that the Western
44 Interior is dealing with this, when we do
45 meet out in the villages, we select from now
46 on all future meetings out in the villages

1 will have evening sessions at the call of
2 the host village. So thank you all for
3 bearing with us, but that's what we want to
4 do is get all these answers.

5 Harry?

6 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Yeah,
7 Rich, you don't have any idea if this
8 proposal funded, how many fall chum salmon
9 would be tagged? And for locations where,
10 from where?

11 MR. CANNON: No, sir. They have
12 goals, sampling goals that they try to
13 sample so many fish by putting a tag in it
14 each week. So, we can provide that. It's
15 300 a day, I guess, for fall chum, and they
16 have a specific number. And then they
17 keep -- as was said, they try to keep track
18 of these tags each time that they're
19 collected, and they look at the sex of the
20 fish and the condition of the fish when it's
21 caught.

22 MR. SAM: Any further questions,
23 Council members?

24 I thought I saw a hand up from
25 the audience. Was there any other hands up?
If not, next.

MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
the next proposal before you is 01-056 --
I'm sorry, 01-044, the "Summer Chum in the
Innoko Drainage." This project was not
recommended for funding by the TRC.

I'd like to open it up for
questions and comment.

MR. SAM: Council members have
questions on 01-044, summer chum in Innoko
drainage?

Anyone from the public audience?
Any questions whatsoever on
01-044?

Jack Reakoff?

MR. REAKOFF: Are there any -- is
there some other type of escapement program
on the Innoko drainage?

1 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Currently there
2 is an ongoing project looking at potential
3 at weir sites on the Innoko drainage. They
4 did do some pilot work this summer with this
5 project and put out some transmitters to
6 look at feasibility of catching chinook and
 summer chum and monitoring their -- I guess
 their migration into the drainage to try to
 identify spawning areas. So, there is some
 work being conducted in the drainage
 currently, yes.

7 MR. SAM: Any further questions?
8 If not, then go into 01-056.

9 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
10 this is the "North Fork Andreafsky Weir
11 Project." The project is requesting funding
12 for an additional weir on the Andreafsky
13 River system.

14 I'd like to open it up for
15 questions and testimony.

16 MR. SAM: Questions from the
17 Councils?

18 Again, this is another project
19 that might not be funded.
20 John Hanson?

21 MR. HANSON: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
22 Chairman. Andreafsky has an East Fork weir
23 and this is one of the ones last January
24 that was prioritized from Rich Cannon. Now,
25 why would the committee say "no" on it,
 because this is going to be a useful tool
 for the lower part of the river, for king
 salmon, for summer chums, fall chums, cohos.
 Why are they not funding it? Is this
 because they just have no funds?

26 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
27 Mr. Hanson, the TRC recognized the
28 importance of this project to get a total
29 escapement for the Andreafsky River and the
30 problem was simply that there wasn't enough
31 funding to fund all the good projects that
32 were presented.

33 The TRC recommended that the
34 funding of the genetics work was a higher
35 priority since we were already funding one

1 of the weir projects on the Andreafsky. So
2 they had some estimate of the run timing and
abundance of fish migrating into the system.

3 So, although this would have
4 given a complete escapement coverage for the
Andreafsky, the priority was given to
5 additional information needs on the Yukon
and the lack of funding didn't allow them
6 to, you know, fund all of the good projects
that were presented.

7 MR. HANSON: Yeah. Does the
8 Department of Fish & Game have the power on
the North Fork? They used to have one time,
but I guess they never --

9 MR. CANNON: There was -- I
10 believe there was a tower at one time on one
of the forks. We'd have to bring up
11 Bergstrom or somebody. He's got the best
memory on that. My memory sometimes isn't
12 very good.

13 MR. SANDONE: My name is Gene
Sandone. I'm the regional supervisor for
14 AYK Com Fish. We never had an assessment on
the ground for the North Fork. We had
15 sonar; we had a tower on the East Fork; and
now the Fish & Wildlife Service has a weir.
16 But we've only had aerial survey assessment
of the North Fork.

17 MR. HANSON: Your aerial survey,
18 is it an accurate survey? Some years -- I
seen on the Department's escapement streams
19 where it says Andreafsky -- due to muddy
water, high water, nothing was found out --

20 MR. SANDONE: Mr. Hanson, you're
21 right, in some cases when water conditions
are adverse, we can't get a good estimate on
22 the streams. However, when we do fly both
forks and look at salmon species such as
23 chinook, there is a good correlation between
the numbers in the East Fork and the numbers
24 in the North Fork. And to the limited
extent that we have aerial surveys for
25 summer chum salmon it is also true that when
the East Fork is doing well, the West Fork
is also -- or the North Fork is also doing

1 well, and vice versa.

2 MR. SAM: Any further questions?
3 Billy McCann?

4 MR. McCANN: All your aerial
5 surveys, when you're flying so high up or
6 something, so is the guy that I was going to
7 ask -- maybe you can do it, on the aerial
8 survey, are you exactly seeing fish -- what
9 are they -- what are you seeing down in the
10 water? How do you exactly know what kind of
11 fish you are seeing in the water when you're
12 on the air survey?

13 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, yeah,
14 the only -- I'm not the best person to
15 answer that. Usually when I'm on the aerial
16 survey, I have my face in a sack, but what I
17 can tell you is that a good aerial survey
18 will look for a place where they can see the
19 fish spread out, where they are spread out
20 on their spawning areas. Some cases an
21 aerial surveyor will be able to get a
22 feeling about the numbers of fish just by
23 are there a whole lot or very few. It's
24 relative, and they look enough, they get a
25 feeling for that. But it's not an exact
thing at all, and they fly very low and a
lot faster than I like to and they're
turning all the time. So it's a hard thing
to do. It takes a lot of practice.

Some people are very good at it
and some people are not very good at it.

18 MR. SAM: Billy?

19 MR. McCANN: The reason why I'm
20 asking -- whatever you're flying with,
21 there's on the river -- upriver stream, all
22 kind of fish up there, Dolly Vardens,
23 whatever it can be, and you're trying to
24 count chum salmon or red salmon, whatever,
25 and you might see mixed up either one of
those fish. That's one reason why I'm
asking. Are you actually seeing correct
fish?

25 MR. SAM: Rich?

1 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, yeah,
2 but it can be a problem if you have two
3 species that look alike and they're in the
4 same place at the same time. Often the fish
5 will have a little different color and
6 they'll be at different places. The salmon
7 are going to be usually there in the largest
8 numbers. Remember, it's not an exact count.
9 It's an index. You're trying to see are
10 there a lot compared to last year or are
11 there very few compared to last year.

12 When you see the records,
13 sometimes information presented as an actual
14 number of fish, it's an estimate at best.
15 It's a judgment on how that surveyor was
16 able to make an estimate on a given day, on
17 a given stream. So, you're just looking at
18 a lot or very few fish. It's not an exact
19 count.

20 MR. SAM: Thank you, Rich.
21 Again, I would like you to direct your
22 questions to the question at hand, whether
23 we should fund this project or not instead
24 of how --

25 So, any further questions on the
funding or not funding this project?
If not, 01-121.

1 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
2 this project is "Run Timing, Migratory
3 Patterns, and Harvest Information of Chinook
4 Salmon Stocks within the Yukon River." This
5 was ranked No. 1 by the TRC and recommended
6 for funding.

7 I'll open it for any questions or
8 comments.

9 MR. SAM: Questions for Rich and
10 Cliff?
11 Gerald?

12 MR. NICHOLIA: I'm sorry. It's
13 going to be like a fish genetics study.

14 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
15 Mr. Nicholia, I'd like to ask Bill Spearman
16 to come up here. He was the geneticist on
17 staff at the time that they did the reviews
18 on these proposals. They also went through

1 an extensive external review that he
2 organized. So, I think in fairness to the
3 projects and the investigators, Bill will be
able to speak on these projects, 02-121 and
02-097, more appropriately.

4 MR. SAM: Just a second. Then
5 we're taking both of these projects on at
one time?

6 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
7 that's up to you. We can do them one at a
time or both at one time.

8 MR. SAM: All right. Okay.
9 Gerald has a -- and then next we'll
recognize Lester.

10 MR. NICHOLIA: What I asked, is
11 it like the genetics where you take the
12 scales and get the DNA data off there, and
13 you're going to store it? If that's the
14 case, could it be used -- could it be
15 associated with like -- if we get a study on
the migration, could that possibly use that
information with, like -- if it's possible
the National Marine Fisheries, they plan to
do a genetic study and study the salmon
migration route in the ocean?

16 MR. SPEARMAN: Mr. Chairman,
17 Council members, my name is Bill Spearman.
18 I'm with the Fish & Wildlife Service. I'm a
19 geneticist with the Service. Mr. Nicholia,
20 the short answer to your question is "yes."
21 In general, this chinook genetics project
22 will result in the establishment of a
23 genetic baseline for the Yukon River, and
24 for in-river applications. It will be very
25 useful for determining the number of
populations of chinook salmon in the river
system, and identifying their boundaries.
And then for fishery applications within the
river, the baseline can be used for
analyzing the stock composition of the
fisheries, identifying which populations
come through the fisheries, and when they
come through.

So, that's in-river applications.
For outside river applications,

1 the baseline would be very useful when it's
2 combined with baseline for other systems for
3 identifying migratory corridors and pathways
4 out in the ocean, and it could also
5 theoretically be used for addressing issues
6 of interceptions and by-catch in other
7 fisheries. And the genetic techniques that
8 are being used are several. There's two
9 basic techniques that are being used. One
10 is looking at the protein variation, and
11 that requires taking multiple tissue samples
12 from the fish, and typically, it results in
13 the death of the fish.

14 So, any protein sample that also
15 would be taken would be from fish that are
16 spawned out or that are going to be killed
17 for other purposes.

18 Some protein information can be
19 taken from nonlethal samples, for example, a
20 fin clip that's been preserved, say, in
21 liquid nitrogen and protein information can
22 be gathered there. The other technique
23 that's being used is several DNA techniques,
24 and the sample collection for that is
25 nonlethal and the DNA is just taken from
like a fin clip that can be taken from the
fish, and the fish can then be let go to
continue on with its migration.

I'll stop there and see if you
have any further questions on that.

MR. SAM: Lester?
Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: What's your
confidence level with this type of DNA -- I
mean, is there very marked differences
between different stocks or is it kind of
gray, or what's your confidence on these
types of analysis?

MR. PEDERSEN: That's a very good
question, and what we found in general is
that different species of salmon have
different population structures, and
sometimes between different populations,
like, say, chum, there will be small
differences. What we found with chinook
salmon between populations, we can see very
great differences using the genetic methods.

1 Some work has already been done with
2 proteins, with chinook salmon in the Yukon
3 River, and some of the tests indicated that
4 individual spawning stocks can be identified
5 very clearly using the protein methods.

6 In other cases, with some other
7 populations in the Yukon River, they were
8 formed by aggregations of several spawning
9 groups.

10 So, the different spawning
11 groups, say, in the lower river, didn't
12 necessarily form individual spawning
13 populations genetically.

14 Together, though, they -- they
15 were very clear.

16 As you get farther upriver, say,
17 into the Yukon Territory, the results
18 indicated that there is discrimination --
19 good discrimination down to the individual
20 spawning group level.

21 So, it looks like, based on those
22 results, it looks like there's potential to
23 apply genetics as a tool for fisheries
24 management in the Yukon River, and that just
25 in general that we probably can get very
good discrimination, making genetics a very
powerful tool that can be used in
conjunction with our fisheries tools in the
system.

MR. SAM: Lester, you had a
question?

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: No.

MR. SAM: Any further questions?
Anyone from the audience?

MR. MOSES: (Through the
interpreter.) They're asking about any --
the fish in the mountains, they go with the
kites, the fish there stay -- they stay
there, they don't go out to the ocean and
the other fish, the whitefish we call
them -- with the other fish, the pike fish.
They -- they stay in freshwater rivers.

They just -- the freshwater, they
don't go out with the fish, but the red fish
and the humpies. They go upstream to spawn,
but we look at our Elders -- we look at the

1 fish that are going upstream to spawn. They
2 tell us that they died there when they go
3 upriver to spawn after they have fish eggs
4 and when they have -- they die after they
5 have their fish eggs.

6 The fish eggs were not in the
7 ocean. They don't go upriver the mountain
8 streams are, but once in a great while, they
9 go upriver, where the mountains are, but
10 they go -- they go there to spawn. They go
11 upriver from the ocean. They go up to the
12 rivers.

13 But these other fish, the
14 freshwater fish, they go upriver, that's
15 where they swim is upriver. And then they
16 go downriver after they have babies; they
17 don't go out of that river.

18 That's how the fish are, that
19 they go out to the ocean.

20 But the reds and the chum,
21 they're just like swimming in our rivers.
22 What we call the trap -- and the king salmon
23 and the reds, they don't have the same
24 names. They go upriver to spawn, but before
25 they die they rot and they have their eggs,
but they go and the male salmon, they go
upriver to have babies or that's what they
do.

But the reds they go out to where
they come from, that's --

TRANSLATOR BRYANT: That's what
he hears from the Fish & Game.

MR. MOSES: (Through the
interpreter.) That they come back to where
they were born. But the humpies are far out
and even though the river is not very low,
they come upstream to spawn, even though the
river's not a very good river, the water
that comes down from the mountains, that's
where they come.

TRANSLATOR BRYANT: That's what
he'd like to say. Where the fish come up
and they go out to the ocean.

MR. MOSES: (Through the
interpreter.) And what's in the -- they cut
the fish. I understand they call them

1 salmon red, but that's because all the
2 salmon have red meat, but he means all
3 salmon.

3 MR. SAM: Thank you. Sometimes,
4 we have to be brief, and we listen to our
5 Elders.

6 So, if we're back on track, then
7 we are looking at 02-097.

8 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
9 this is "Sex Ratios of Juvenile and Adult
10 Chinook Salmon in the Yukon and Kuskokwim
11 Rivers." Again, I'll address these
12 questions to Bill Spearman, our geneticist.
13 Thank you.

14 MR. SAM: Questions. I think you
15 handled a few already, but it might be wise
16 to reiterate some questions for Cliff, on
17 02-097.

18 Anything from the public
19 audience?

20 If not, our next step would be go
21 on to page 17 or --

22 MR. MATHEWS: No, Mr. Chairman,
23 now would you look at these as a block. You
24 would look at the recommendations of the
25 Technical Review Committee, the projects
that are in bold. Do you agree with those
going forward as funding with your
recommendation?

26 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.:
27 Mr. Chairman?

28 MR. SAM: All right, Harry.

29 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: These
30 would be done as a block and go down the way
31 they are? I want to -- the one to recommend
32 -- could I make a motion that we could vote
33 on the block, the one they recommend?

34 MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

35 THE WITNESS: Make a motion to
vote on the one they recommend including
20-009, Pilot Station sonar.

1 That's my motion.

2 MR. SAM: Yeah, Harry if I read
3 your motion correctly, you are moving to
4 adopt 02-011, 02-121, 02-097, and 02-009?
5 Is that correct?

6 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Yeah.

7 MR. SAM: Is there a second?

8 MR. HANSON: Second.

9 MR. SAM: Any further discussion?

10 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm a
11 little bothered by adding that for reasons
12 of the precedent that they were talking
13 about. If there are technicians being hired
14 in all of these projects and for this
15 particular one we funded a technician that's
16 separated from the project, how will we deal
17 with all the others? The suggestion was
18 that they were saying that the funding
19 should come from the ones that are
20 sponsoring the project. They should include
21 funding for technicians. I'd like a little
22 thought or a little discussion on that.
23 Because we are setting a precedent here of
24 just funding a technician while the project
25 is being funded by someone else.

 MR. SAM: Rich or Cliff?

 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, yes,
there have been some other capacity-building
projects where you've funded a Tribal group
to provide a technician, and I think the
concern that was raised is that -- is that
something that we need to continue doing or
do we need to move to a more of a general
approach. As Steve Klein was suggesting
that in all of these projects that it should
be built right in, that local, you know,
hires or some partnership arrangement be
developed right within the project itself to
provide for this kind of opportunity to be
involved with the project. And so we have
done this in some other areas, there's a
project in the Kuskokwim that I'll be

1 talking about later that we're doing this,
2 but the concern is that we're doing this in
3 a few projects to help show people that this
4 can be done and it can be done successfully,
5 and now the question is: Do we need to --
6 the question is: Do we need to do this on a
7 case-by-case basis with each project for
8 special projects, or can we just make this a
9 principal that we'll use for all the
10 projects that we'll find that we want this
11 kind of partnership development or local
12 hires used in the project itself?

13 MR. SAM: Thank you, Rich. I
14 kind of agree with Ray's concern, and what
15 you just stressed.

16 I think if you get a grant or
17 some funding that you fund the whole
18 project, you fund the whole project,
19 equipment, technician and everything. I
20 think that -- planting State money from here
21 and there or move money from here to here, I
22 agree with that approach. I see some hands
23 up.

24 Vince?

25 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman,
26 you do have some hands up in the audience,
27 and I think one was Ida and there's others
28 in the back that we probably need to get up
29 to the table to discuss this.

30 MR. SAM: Okay. The Chair would
31 recognize Ida Hildebrand and ask that you
32 use a mike right next to Rich Cannon.

33 MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you, Mr.
34 Chairman. Ida Hildebrand, BIA staff
35 committee member. I just wanted to caution
36 the Council, it can be dealt with however
37 the Council chooses, but if you're voting on
38 a block that the TRC recommended, then it
39 would be just the "yes" projects. If Harry
40 wants to add on that project, you don't have
41 to do this, Harry, I'm just suggesting it,
42 you can make a second motion to add on the
43 project. And the reason I'm separating it
44 into two motions or recommending two motions
45 is if you add on the project Harry is
46 interested in, you have to take off another

1 project.

2 So I'm just cautioning the
3 Councils, when you add on a project, you
4 have to remove another project.

5 Just so you'll be cognizant of
6 that fact.

7 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 MR. SAM: So, Ida, you are then
9 recommending that we ask withdraw with
10 consent of the second -- to withdraw the
11 motion of adding on 009, and hitting it -- I
12 mean, making a separate motion to seek money
13 for it?

14 MS. HILDEBRAND: Yes,
15 Mr. Chairman, I'm suggesting that Harry
16 consider that. However, it is Harry's
17 decision.

18 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.:
19 Mr. Chairman, the reason I want to see this
20 Pilot Station sonar get funded, all of you
21 know that even the committees know that, we
22 know that, we've been -- we're from Lower
23 Yukon, we've been hearing all the time what
24 the sonar is doing up in Pilot Station.
25 They use that for looking at, expecting the
fish will get there and all that. I think
it's very important for the Yukon River, up
and down, how's the sonar doing. It's not
only the first time that -- just like
last -- two years, when the fish was -- not
very many fish going into Yukon, do you
really keep down the sonar, do you know when
the fish are going to get there? I got
people calling me from upriver. They want
already for the fish coming in. They depend
on that sonar. I think it's one of the most
important. I wouldn't mind to -- I wouldn't
mind to see get rid of one of these here.
And funding that sonar.

MR. SAM: Thank you, Harry.
Ida?

MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. Harry, there seems to also be
some confusion, the sonar is funded under a
different project. This isn't saying we're

1 not going to fund the sonar. The sonar is
2 funded and the TRC has recommended that
3 funding. This is a separate project just to
4 hire a technician.

5 MR. SAM: Is that clear, Harry?

6 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Yeah.

7 MR. SAM: Okay. Did we have
8 anyone -- thanks for clarifying that.
9 Any other person?
10 State your name and agency.

11 MR. SANDONE: My name is Gene
12 Sandone. I'm the regional supervisor for
13 Yukon Kuskokwim Sport Fisheries Division. I
14 just want to clear up a misconception.
15 Yukon sonar is fully funded without this
16 technician. We have the funds to operate at
17 full capacity the Yukon sonar. This
18 position mainly is for capacity-building and
19 for local hire, and for training local
20 people. It helps us by providing an
21 additional technician on the project, and it
22 also helps us greatly with helping the
23 people understand what the sonar is doing,
24 just by having a local hire there.

25 So, that's the benefits we
receive from this position.

I'm not -- I don't want to
address what the scientific technical
committee did, but I just want to clear up a
misconception that we're not fully funding
this program.

ADF&G is fully funding this
program without this technician.

MR. SAM: Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: How much Federal
funds are you receiving to fund the pilot
Station program?

MR. SANDONE: Federal funds
different than OSM? It's fully funded under
Federal projects. It's mainly U. S./Canada,
and we also have some disaster money that is
going to Yukon sonar.

1 MR. SAM: Any further testimony?
2 Questions of the Council?

3 There is a motion on the floor
4 and it's seconded.

5 I'd like to bring Ida back up.
6 For my clarification, what you
7 are suggesting, then, is that I asked the
8 motion maker and the seconder to withdraw
9 and then ask for a motion to block vote in
10 these three "yes" votes? That would be the
11 correct way to go?

12 MS. HILDEBRAND: Yes,
13 Mr. Chairman, he could do that, or he could
14 just withdraw the portion of his motion that
15 referred to 0009. Either way would
16 accomplish the same.

17 MR. SAM: Is this understood by
18 the Councils?

19 How do you want to handle that,
20 Harry? Do I understand that the sonar
21 project is fully funded and staffed at this
22 time? Do you want to just withdraw that
23 part or --

24 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: I'm going
25 to stand for my motion.

MR. SAM: David?

MR. JAMES: Is there any
possibility that we can, you know, trim off
that 02-01 -- I mean, 02-121 and put some of
that fundings up to 02-009?

Go ahead, Rich.

MR. CANNON: Yes, David, the
Council can make recommendations for people
to go back and look at other funding
options. One thing that's possible is that
rather than -- the project you're talking
about is not a large dollar amount compared
to some of the other projects you're looking
at. You could simply, as a -- tri-Council
recommendation say if there's funding
available through carryover funds or through
other funding arrangements within the Office
of Subsistence Management, you'd like to see
this project funded, and that would give us,

1 then, the indication of your priorities
2 about this project, and if we can find that
3 funding, then we can go ahead and move it
4 forward.

5 MR. SAM: Not the way the motion
6 reads. The motion is stated strongly that
7 we just outrightly fund this, if I read it
8 right. Correct me if I'm wrong.

9 MR. CANNON: Procedurally,
10 Mr. Chairman, you're correct. I was just
11 simply offering an alternative way of
12 dealing with it in response to David's
13 question about looking at changing the
14 funding around with the other projects.

15 MR. SAM: If we vote on this, if
16 we all vote yes on this, what we are doing
17 then is just outrightly directing you to
18 fund another technician at the Pilot
19 Station?

20 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, the
21 problem that I think we're dealing with is
22 that -- you have to take that money out of
23 some other project that you're looking at
24 there on your list. We've got the funds
25 pretty much fully allocated, and when you
26 look at the table, you have to remember that
27 there was an error in those numbers and
28 Cliff tried to straighten that out. My
29 understanding is that the money has been
30 fully allocated under the technical review
31 committee's recommendation. So that \$20,000
32 comes from somewhere.

33 MR. SAM: What's the wishes of
34 the Councils?
35 Willard Church?

36 MR. CHURCH: Mr. Chairman, I'd
37 like to ask a question. Richard, someone
38 mentioned earlier that a precedent would be
39 set if this project was funded and I'd like
40 to have that explained a little more
41 thoroughly.

42 MR. CANNON: Yes, I think that
43 comment was based on looking at the

1 possibility that every project would have
2 this kind of request made for it, and I
3 think what Steve Klein -- the point he was
4 trying to make was that a better approach
5 would be, in general, would be that for
6 every project there should be local hire,
7 that there should be an opportunity for
8 partnership building, that that should
9 become the standard approach to doing a
10 project in this area rather than just add
11 this on with a special funding request like
12 this.

13 We have done this in other areas
14 as a way of -- in special cases to help, as
15 Gene Sandone said, to help establish better
16 relationships and better communication with
17 local communities and Tribal groups for
18 specific projects.

19 We're doing that, for example,
20 in -- from a weir, we've got an ONC employee
21 up there training on observation of weirs.
22 So, this isn't the only one we're doing it
23 on, but the concern was is that we shouldn't
24 make this a precedent so that we see it done
25 all the time.

MR. SAM: Willard Church?

MR. CHURCH: Having worked with
both the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and
the Alaska Department of Fish & Game on some
projects down in my area, specifically the
weir project on the Kanektok River, the way
the project is being funded on moneys, I
believe, from OSM, any way for a Native,
local Native person from my community to be
employed was through separate funding that
we received from various sea Fishermen's
Association just for local hire, and I
believe AVCP also received some funding.
She had mentioned that that funding had been
decreasing in increments over the past few
years.

Well, in order for a local person
to be on that project through the
investigator, the management -- the
Department that's responsible for management
of project, he or she would have to be hired
as an employee of that department as a
technician and working for the Alaska

1 Department of Fish & Game, probably as a
2 Tech II. And there's a -- and in our
3 community, for example, there's very few
4 people that want to work with the Alaska
5 Department of Fish & Game, and very few that
6 would even be willing to work with the U.S.
7 Fish & Wildlife Service. They prefer to
8 work through their own Native Tribal
9 organizations or agencies, and I think
10 that's something we need to consider when we
11 look at proposals that are submitted for
12 developing that capacity with our Tribal
13 members, with our Native residents living in
14 our areas, and that's my opinion.

15 That's based on two years of
16 working with a project down in Quinhagak.
17 That's my personal experience.

18 MR. SAM: Any further comments or
19 questions?

20 Jack?

21 MR. REAKOFF: My personal feeling
22 is that the Technical Review Committee went
23 through a lot of deliberations on these
24 projects, and the three projects that
25 they've highlighted are very worthwhile
projects. I would personally not like to
see any of the fundings trimmed from any of
those projects, and I feel that a funding
source should be found for that Pilot
Station sonar position from some other area.
But to trim off funding from these very
worthwhile projects I don't feel is very
wise, because these projects are going to be
very instrumental in managing these very
important fish for the entire Yukon
drainage.

26 MR. SAM: Mary Gregory?

27 MS. GREGORY: I have a question.
28 How many geneticists do you need to do a
29 study on the 121 project? I notice you're
30 hiring several people in there?

31 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Are you talking
32 about the cooperation between the State and
33 the --

1 MS. GREGORY: 02-121.

2 MR. SCHLEUSNER: The
3 cooperation --

4 MS. GREGORY: Page 35 is where
5 I'm getting my information from.
6 Investigators. Doesn't say how many.

7 MR. SCHLEUSNER: The
8 investigators -- originally this was two
9 separate proposals, one presented by the
10 State and one presented by the U.S. Fish and
11 Wildlife Service that went through external
12 review. Because this issue isn't just a
13 State or a Federal issue, or for that matter
14 just an Alaska issue since these fish
15 stocks -- a lot of them originate in
16 Canadian waters. It was the recommendation
17 of the external reviewers that a
18 collaborative project between the State Fish
19 and Wildlife service and the Canadian
20 department, DFO, work together on this
21 project so that we don't duplicate effort,
22 so that we all are on the same page and
23 develop the same --

24 MS. GREGORY: My question is:
25 How many people do you intend to hire?
26 You're going to hire -- U.S. Fish & Wildlife
27 is hiring -- I'm sorry, are you U.S. Fish &
28 Wildlife too?

29 MR. CANNON: Yes, we are.

30 MR. SCHLEUSNER: I guess I can't
31 I -- I guess I can't answer that question
32 directly. I don't know if they are
33 intending on hiring new biologists for that
34 project or not.

35 MS. GREGORY: On your objectives,
36 No. 2, you're collecting from Pilot Station
37 anyway. Why not hire somebody from there?
38 Why not fund the project -- that one person
39 at Pilot Station?

40 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Bill Spearman is
41 going to try and answer that question for
42 you, Mary.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

MR. SPEARMAN: This is Bill Spearman, on that chinook genetics project. I can't say specifically how many local hires that they had planned, but local hires were integrated into the budget for that particular project. Is that the question?

I'm -- hiring more geneticists, no, the plan wasn't to hire additional geneticists just to implement that particular project. There are three laboratories involved with that project; U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Alaska Department of Fish & Game and Canada Department of Fisheries and Oceans that were collaborating on this, and they were going to use existing staff capabilities and facilities to construct the genetic baseline.

11

12

13

MR. SAM: It seems like we are hung up here, so we either put it to a roll call vote, either defeat it or pass it. Any further comments? Gerald?

14

15

MR. NICHOLIA: If this full Council don't get votes on it, it goes back to our own individual Councils, Vince?

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. MATHEWS: You have that option to vote individual Councils, you have that option. It would be best to get a consensus on it, and maybe a suggestion right now since we have so much information flying around the room would be to break for lunch and bring this motion back up, because I think some of you need to talk to each other and to staff over lunch on this issue. It might be wiser to wait until after lunch.

22

23

24

MR. SAM: I do not know if that will help. We're all firm in our standings. But what's the wishes of the three Councils? Do we want to break for lunch?

25

Mr. Chairman?

MR. MORGAN: Thank you. I would also, if you guys -- whoever is going to

1 meet, please identify where you're going to
2 get this additional \$20,000. Who you're
3 going to take it from, and you're going to
4 have to take it from somebody. I think
5 we're dealing with bottom-line dollars here.
6 And we're going to have to take it from some
7 other, either inter-staff, or staff, or
8 other projects from different rivers. We're
9 going to have to take it from other moneys,
10 the moneys that's already existing, and if
11 we do -- if you are still very adamant about
12 this, identify -- identify who you're going
13 to take it from.

8 MR. SAM: Thanks for that
9 clarification, Carl, because we all know the
10 economy is down, we're at war, be it
11 one-sided or whatever you want to call it.
12 Please do think about where you're going to
13 take that money from.

11 Della?

12 MS. TRUMBLE: Thank you,
13 Mr. Chairman. Just a suggestion. And I
14 don't know if it can be done, but if you
15 were looking at the 02-121 and the 02-097,
16 they are for the same species of fish, and
17 whether 02-097 can be incorporated into
18 02-121, it's the same people and departments
19 that are working the studies. And to take
20 the difference over the two-year period
21 which isn't \$20,000 that Harry is looking
22 for in 02-009 as a suggestion to consider.

18 MR. SAM: Thank you.
19 You had something to add, there.

20 MR. NICHOLIA: I think we could
21 settle it there -- see, what we got to do,
22 Harry, is we got to take money from one of
23 these other ones and put it to the other
24 one, because where this money is going to
25 come from, I don't know. It's going to have
26 to come from one of these other projects.
27 These two projects on the bottom here is
28 very important, what Craig is working for,
29 to get the migration patterns in the ocean,
30 trying to find out where our fish is going,
31 what's happening to our fish in the ocean,
32 and I wouldn't want to say -- but -- but

1 where would you need -- I think this might
2 end going to three separate Councils, Vince.

3 MR. SAM: Thank you, Gerald.
4 How much time do we want for
5 lunch, hour, 15? Hour and a half?
6 Come back at 1:30, thank you.

7 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman,
8 Mr. Chairman.

9 MR. SAM: Ray?

10 MR. COLLINS: One thing we might
11 want to think about over lunch, if I propose
12 to mention and state that 20 be sought or
13 carry over to within the one, so they're not
14 from the identified, we come back with a
15 strong recommendation that they find the
16 moneys in the subsistence division
17 somewhere. That would be one alternative,
18 but we wouldn't be identifying specifics.

19 MR. SAM: You still have to go to
20 the steps of withdrawing the second and
21 withdrawing the motion.

22 MR. COLLINS: You'd move to
23 modify -- you'd move to amend the motion,
24 change the wording on the part of --

25 MR. SAM: Okay. Let's think
about that.

(Lunch break.)

MR. SAM: Please come back to
your seats, I'd like to reconvene.

I'd like to call the meeting back
to order. We have two or three options to
work on the motion on the floor. The first
option -- okay. The first option is that we
second and maker of the motion withdraw,
however, it doesn't appear -- the second
option is to have a friendly amendment to
amend the motion that -- this motion doesn't
detract from the three approved proposals.
And what was the other option? And the
third option was that we work on this at our
separate Councils.

1 Go ahead, Gerald.

2 MR. NICHOLIA: I'd like to ask
3 Harry and John Hanson, the motion and the
4 second of the motion that if we add a
5 amendment to this, what you guys did that
6 the Pilot Station sonar, the 2,000 that's
7 going to be directed to the agencies to
8 acquire the funding from carryover funds or
9 some other source of funding, and that the
10 20,000 don't be detracted from those other
11 three proposed deals, if that's all right
12 with the motion-maker and the seconder, that
13 would be a friendly amendment to the motion,
14 so that it will still be in there. We still
15 support it as three Councils, but the
16 funding wouldn't be taken from the three
17 proposals, the funding would be from our
18 sources; the funding that the agencies would
19 be directed to them by this friendly motion.

20 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: I'll
21 support that.

22 MR. NICHOLIA: Okay.

23 MR. HANSON: All right with me.

24 MR. SAM: Is that your consent?

25 MR. HANSON: (Nods head.)

26 MR. SAM: Gerald, was that a
27 friendly amendment? Is that in the form of
28 a motion?

29 MR. NICHOLIA: We'd like to vote
30 on that and vote on the motion.

31 MR. SAM: Is there a second to
32 that amendment?

33 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Second.

34 MR. SAM: Seconded by Angela
35 Demientieff. Any discussions? What this
36 amendment does is that it addresses the firm
37 commitment, the YK Delta delegates that we
38 continue to seek and ask for local hire.
39 This is an honorable request and the funding

1 we are seeking should come from leftover
2 funding and many of you know this as a fact
3 that a lot of our funded projects never goes
4 into effect. In other words, if there's
5 high water, they just drop that project for
6 good, for the season. And we'd ask these
7 fundings to come from these sources. We
8 would also ask that funding sought from
9 other sources by the affected agencies and
10 regions and the Councils.

11 Are there any more questions?
12 Vince?

13
14 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, you
15 must be spending too much time with me, you
16 may be doing the same mistake I made
17 yesterday, the mover of the motion and the
18 second agreed to a friendly amendment.
19 There is no question, they agreed to
20 incorporate that. Is that correct, Harry?

21 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Yeah.

22 MR. MATHEWS: They've agreed by
23 friendly action to change their original
24 motion.

25 MR. SAM: Is this understood by
all Councils?
Okay.

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Question,
Mr. Chairman.

MR. SAM: Thank you, Lester. At
this time, I would like a roll call vote.
Vince, can you handle it?

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman,
I've just got to flip a few pages here. I
apologize.

The other coordinators will have
to capture the vote, I have so many notes
around all the names.

For Yukon Kuskokwim Delta, Alvin
Owletuck.

MR. OWLETUCK: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: Lester Wilde?

1 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Yes.
2 MR. MATHEWS: Phillip Moses?
3 MR. MOSES: Yes.
4 MR. MATHEWS: James Charles?
5 MR. CHARLES: Yes.
6 MR. MATHEWS: Billy McCann?
7 MR. McCANN: Yes.
8 MR. MATHEWS: Willard Church?
9 MR. CHURCH: Yes.
10 MR. MATHEWS: Fritz George? Not
11 here.
12 Mary Gregory? Not here.
13 John Hanson?
14 MR. HANSON: Yes.
15 MR. MATHEWS: Harry Wilde?
16 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Yes.
17 MR. MATHEWS: Majority have voted
18 in favor for it.
19 Carl Morgan?
20 MR. MORGAN: Yes.
21 MR. MATHEWS: Benedict Jones?
22 MR. JONES: Yes.
23 MR. MATHEWS: Angela Demientieff?
24 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.
25 MR. MATHEWS: Sampson Henry?
Jack Reakoff?
MR. REAKOFF: Yes.
MR. SAM: Ray Collins?

1

MR. COLLINS: Yes.

2

MR. MATHEWS: Ron Sam?

3

MR. SAM: Yes.

4

MR. MATHEWS: Majority supports
the motion.

6

Gerald Nicholia?

7

MR. NICHOLIA: Yes.

8

MR. MATHEWS: Jim Wilde?

9

MR. JIM WILDE: Yes.

10

MR. MATHEWS: David James?

11

MR. JAMES: Yes.

12

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, all
three Councils by majority vote accept the
motion.

14

MR. NICHOLIA: With the friendly
amendments?

15

MR. MATHEWS: Yes.

16

MR. SAM: I'd like to thank the
Councils for the united stand.

17

There is one item I'd like to
share with you before we continue. There is
a reason for Fritz George's absence. It was
brought to my attention before we started
that his grandfather died, and he had to
take off immediately for the funeral, for
the funeral preparations. His grandfather
is also Mike Williams' father-in law.
Without going any further and in deference
and respect to Fritz George who I enjoy
working with, I would like a moment of
silence.

24

(Moment of silence.)

25

MR. SAM: Thank you, again, for
your unity.

1 That -- we'll turn to page 17.

2 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I
3 just have two housekeeping things before we
4 go to the next section.

5 I need to announce because there
6 are staff and representatives from different
7 organizations that the Bristol Bay Regional
8 Advisory Council meeting scheduled to begin
9 tomorrow has been postponed. So for those
10 that were trying to get to the Bristol Bay
11 Regional Council meeting, may want to
12 consult with staff as to when that's being
13 rescheduled.

14 The other housekeeping item that
15 we talked about during your officers'
16 meeting that there's staff in Anchorage.
17 Laura Jurgensen has invited all the Council
18 members to her house this evening. If you'd
19 like to participate in that, we can provide
20 transportation. If you have your own
21 transportation, then we have maps. So, if
22 you have questions about that, get ahold of
23 Laura or one of the coordinators.

24 And that's all I had for
25 housekeeping.

26 MR. SAM: Without further adieu,
27 page 17, technical and -- "Traditional
28 Ecological Knowledge."

29 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
30 the first project under the "Harvest
31 Monitoring and Traditional Ecological
32 Knowledge" is 02-030. "Yukon River Salmon
33 Traditional Ecological Knowledge Study."
34 This was a YRDFA-proposed study that was not
35 recommended for funding.

36 I open it up at this time for any
37 questions or testimony.

38 MR. SAM: That is quite a tidy
39 sum, 50,000. Any questions from the
40 Council -- three Councils?
41 Any public testimony?
42 Seeing none, 02-037.

43 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
44 this project, "Harvest Monitoring and
45 Traditional Ecological Knowledge of

1 Subsistence Non-Salmon Fish in the Lower
2 Yukon River," this is the project I spoke on
3 earlier that was modified and the budget
4 figure in here is incorrect. Instead of
5 60.1, it should read 90.1, and this was
6 recommended by the TRC.

7 Again, I would entertain any
8 questions or testimony at this time.

9 MR. SAM: Questions for --
10 Gerald?

11 MR. NICHOLIA: You see the Lower
12 River, I see Tanana Chiefs on here. It's
13 the Middle River.

14 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Oh, sorry.

15 MR. SAM: Any further questions?
16 The Chair will recognize Polly
17 Wheeler. You had a question on this?

18 MS. WHEELER: Thank you,
19 Mr. Chairman. Polly Wheeler with the
20 division of subsistence. This project is a
21 cooperative project with Tanana Chiefs and
22 Gerald Derwrite, Lower Yukon. That was our
23 mistake. We were thinking from the interior
24 perspective, not from the whole perspective
25 on that. It's the villages, Tanana and Holy
Cross. Stanley and I are both here if you
have any questions at some point we'd be
happy to answer them. The project is
actually along the same lines of the project
that we're currently working on in the
Koyukuk River communities.

MR. SAM: Thank you, Polly.
Any further questions?
Any further audience comments?
Seeing none, I'll swing right
into 02-084.

MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
this is a review of oral history tapes on
the traditional ecological knowledge of
subsistence harvests and fishes in Old John
Lake and surrounding water bodies in Arctic
Village, in Alaska. The TRC did recommend
this study. This study is a follow-up study

1 of studies. They needed additional time to
2 complete additional funded projects. Again,
3 answer any questions or entertain any
4 testimony at this time.

5 MR. SAM: Any questions on 02-084
6 from the Council?

7 From the audience?
8 Seeing none. Let's go into
9 02-093.

10 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
11 the Upper Yukon, Porcupine, and Black River
12 salmon habitat evaluation study was not
13 recommended by the TRC. Again, entertain
14 any questions or testimony at this time.

15 MR. SAM: Any questions from the
16 three Councils, 02-093?
17 David James?

18 MR. JAMES: What is the reason
19 for not recommending this project?

20 MR. SCHLEUSNER: The project was
21 a good project. There wasn't any technical
22 reasons for not recommending it. The
23 priorities were given to the GASH region
24 because of the need for the information in
25 that region because of local interests and
26 actually comments raised by the Regional
27 Advisory Councils and did support of two
28 ongoing projects.

29 The other priority was given to
30 the two continuing projects, Projects 84 and
31 006 because they required additional moneys
32 to complete ongoing work.

33 It was a matter of funding, I
34 guess, is a short answer.

35 MR. SAM: Any further questions
36 from the Councils?

37 If not, any questions or comments
38 from the audience?

39 Seeing none. Let's go into
40 02-006.

41 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
42 the monitoring subsistence harvest of Old
43 John Lake, Arctic Village; again, this is a

1 continuation of a previously funded project
2 that required additional time and funding to
3 complete; and it was recommended by the TRC
4 for funding.

5 I'll answer any questions at this
6 time.

7 MR. SAM: Any questions for Cliff
8 or Rich Cannon from the Councils?
9 Benedict Jones?

10 MR. JONES: Thank you,
11 Mr. Chairman. The people from the village
12 use subsistence from the sound lake --

13 MR. SCHLEUSNER: I'm sorry, I
14 didn't understand the question.

15 MR. JONES: Do the people from
16 Arctic still fish for subsistence in this
17 Old John Lake?

18 MR. SCHLEUSNER: It is my
19 understanding, yes. One of the projects is
20 looking at actual harvest monitoring from
21 Old John Lake and the surrounding areas.
22 That is the 006 project that we're
23 discussing right now.

24 MR. SAM: I see a Fairbanks
25 subsistence office person. State your name
again.

MR. ADAMS: My name is Jeff
Adams. I'm the acting project leader at the
Fairbanks Fishery Office. Mr. Jones, I
submitted that investigational plan. I've
worked with Arctic Village. I'm on this
year's project, and initially, the initial
concerns were kind of focused on Old John
Lake, but then as -- through discussions as
the villages started to realize that the
more data that can be collected about their
subsistence uses in the area, the more
important it will be in the long term to be
able to compare for future uses and such. I
noticed a couple of the titles here refer
only to Old John Lake. In effect the
projects actually focused on the waters
surrounding Arctic Village, including Old

1 John Lake.

2 MR. JONES: Does that include the
3 river that's going into Arctic Village?

4 MR. ADAMS: Mr. Jones, the
5 Chandalar? Yes, it does include that.

6 MR. SAM: Any further questions?
7 Any questions or comments from
8 the audience?
9 If not, next step.

10 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, your
11 next step would be either through a motion
12 or through staff asking if there's consensus
13 on the projects that the Technical Review
14 Committee has put forward for funding.

15 So, it can either be through a
16 motion or just by consensus that all
17 parties -- all Council members agree to the
18 recommendations of the Technical Review
19 Committee.

20 MR. SAM: Gerald?

21 MR. NICHOLIA: I'd like to
22 entertain a motion to accept what the TRC
23 approved on this block of proposals?

24 MR. COLLINS: I'd second that,
25 Mr. Chairman.

MR. SAM: Thank you, Ray.
Earlier on there was some
questions how come they didn't prioritize
these things, but I guess it's obvious now
that they did prioritize these, and it's up
to us whether we want go along with these
priorities.

There is a motion which was
seconded to approve of funding these three
projects, 02-037, 084, 02-006. Are there
any more questions or discussion?

MR. NICHOLIA: Question.

MR. SAM: Question has been
called. And maker of the motion requests a
roll call vote.

1 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
2 We'll just change the arrangement
3 a little bit. Eastern Interior. Gerald
4 Nicholia?
5 MR. NICHOLIA: Yes.
6 MR. MATHEWS: Jim Wilde?
7 MR. JIM WILDE: Yes.
8 MR. MATHEWS: David James?
9 MR. JAMES: Yes.
10 MR. MATHEWS: Unanimous for
11 Eastern. Western Interior. Carl Morgan?
12 MR. MORGAN: Yes.
13 MR. MATHEWS: Benedict Jones?
14 MR. JONES: Yes.
15 MR. MATHEWS: Angela Demientieff?
16 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.
17 MR. MATHEWS: Sampson Henry?
18 MR. HENRY: Yes.
19 MR. MATHEWS: Jack Reakoff?
20 MR. REAKOFF: Yes.
21 MR. MATHEWS: Ray Collins?
22 MR. COLLINS: Yes.
23 MR. MATHEWS: Ron Sam?
24 MR. SAM: Yes.
25 MR. MATHEWS: Unanimous support
for the motion with Western.
Yukon Kuskokwim Delta. Harry

1 Wilde?

2 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Yes.

3 MR. MATHEWS: John Hanson?

4 MR. HANSON: Yes.

5 MR. MATHEWS: Mary Gregory?

6 MS. GREGORY: Yes.

7 MR. MATHEWS: Willard Church?

8 MR. CHURCH: Yes.

9 MR. MATHEWS: Billy McCann?

10 MR. McCANN: Yes.

11 MR. MATHEWS: James Charles?

12 MR. CHARLES: Yes.

13 MR. MATHEWS: Phillip Moses?

14 MR. MOSES: Yes.

15 MR. MATHEWS: Lester Wilde?

16 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Yes.

17 MR. MATHEWS: Alvin Owletuck?

18 MR. OWLETUCK: Yes.

19 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, all
20 three Councils by unanimous vote support the
 motion.

21 MR. SAM: Again, the Chair would
22 like to thank you all for your united stand.
23 Just for the record, again, that
 the record will reflect that Fritz George
 was excused.
24 So, without further adieu, we go
 to page 53 on your handbook -- hand outs.
25 Interregional stock, status, and
 trends, FIS, proposed 02-025.

1 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Yes,
2 Mr. Chairman, the first project is the
3 development of a central method of
4 calculating -- a general method for
5 calculation of sustainable subsistence
6 harvest.

7 This project was recommended by
8 the TRC for funding. I'd like to entertain
9 any questions or comments at this time.

10 MR. SAM: Thank you. I think we
11 do have some questions and some testimony.
12 At this time, Lester Wilde,
13 first.

14 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Yeah,
15 Mr. Chairman, I understand the need to speed
16 up a little bit, but I notice that within
17 the book there are writeups on each of these
18 proposals and makes you understand what the
19 program is all about, so it would help if
20 we're able to find exactly what those
21 proposals and the rationale behind the
22 information that's being given out. It
23 would make -- it helps me a lot on making
24 the decisions on whether to support or not
25 support.

MR. SAM: Thank you, Lester.
Either Cliff or Rich, is it in the big book
or is it in the handout?

MR. SCHLEUSNER: It is in the big
book.

I'll find the page number.

MR. MATHEWS: On page 59.

MR. SAM: 59.

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, we do
have blue cards, as we call them, to testify
on this? Stanley Ned of Tanana Chiefs wants
to speak on 025, and I believe there are
other organizations that want to speak on
the Project 025.

MR. SAM: Thank you, Vince.

Were there anymore further
questions from the three Councils?

1 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.:
Mr. Chairman?

2
3 MR. SAM: Go ahead, Harry.

4 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Who is the
investigator here on this -- it says looking
5 at University of Washington, but who is the
person, that investigator on this proposal?

6 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
that's Ray Hilborn. And Milo Adkisson, the
7 University of Alaska.

8 MR. SAM: Thank you.
Any more questions and comments
9 for this -- from this Council?
If not, the Chair would recognize
10 Stanley Ned from the Tanana Chief's Council
for 02-025.

11
12 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, as
Stanley comes up here, there's a letter
passed out dated October 9th from the Tanana
13 Chief's Council, signed by Steve Ginnis,
Arthur Lake, president, Association of
14 Village Council. And the president of
Kawerak, addressing this plan 02-025.

15 MS. GREGORY: Do we have anymore?

16 MR. SAM: It's coming around.

17 MR. SAM: You can give your
testimony. Stanley Ned, Tanana Chiefs, just
18 for the record, state your name.

19 MR. NED: My name is -- excuse
me, my name is Stanley Ned. I work as a
20 staff researcher for Wildlife and Parks at
Tanana Chiefs. The reason why I'm
21 testifying is because we have a concern on
the proposal that's being presented to you.

22 The proposal as it is is really
good, but we have a concern of the person
23 that's doing the actual study. It's Dr. Ray
Hilborn, he's worked for the Area M
24 organization for some time, and we think
that -- we feel that it's going to be a
25 conflict of interest for him to be doing a
study like this based on the problems that

1 we've been having and concerns we had with
2 the people on Area M, especially from the
3 Interio and the AYK area. This letter is
4 signed by Tanana Chiefs President, Steve
5 Ginnis, Association of Village Council
6 Presidents, Art Lake, and also the President
7 of Kawerak, Loretta Bullard.

8 For the record, I am going to
9 read it.

10 Dear Regional Advisory Council
11 Chairs and Members: At this meeting you
12 will be reviewing and considering FIS
13 Interregional Investigation Plan 02-025:
14 Development of General Method for
15 Calculation of Sustainable Subsistence
16 Harvest. This proposal developed by Dr. Ray
17 Hilborn and others proposes to develop an
18 alternative approach for setting BEG's and
19 establishing sustainable subsistence harvest
20 levels.

21 As you know, the setting of BEGs
22 is among the most important components in
23 the management of subsistence fisheries in
24 Alaska. BEG's, once set, effectively drive
25 the rest of the management system.

We have the following concerns
about Dr. Hilborn's proposal: This model
for setting BEG's and sustainable harvest
levels if successful is likely to have
significant implications for the management
of declined salmon stocks such as the
Yukon/Kuskokwim and Norton Sound regions.

Authors of this Investigation
Plan 02-025 indicate that they have had no
consultations with Tribes or regional
institutions within the AYK region prior to
submission.

The principal investigator for
Investigation Plan 02-025, Dr. Hilborn, has
for the past several years served as a
consultant to the Aleutians East Borough.
While in the employ of the Aleutians East
Borough, he has provided fisheries analysis
to support expanded fishing opportunities in
the area M intercept fishery.

Dr. Hilborn's work as a
consultant on behalf of area M fishery
creates a significant conflict of interest
with respect to this new proposal to develop
a BEG model for application in the AYK

1 region and elsewhere.

2 This important work of developing
3 a new approach to establishing BEG's should
4 be undertaken by a more broad-based group of
5 fisheries scientists than is currently
6 proposed.

7 Therefore, we urge you to
8 recommend to the Federal Subsistence Board
9 to not fund FIS Investigation Plan 02-025
10 for this year.

11 We also encourage you to
12 recommend to the Federal Subsistence Board
13 that future BEG research include prior
14 consultations with affected subsistence
15 users and that this research be undertaken
16 with a more broad-based group of fisheries
17 scientists.

18 I think this kind of study is
19 really important. I think if there were
20 other scientists with Dr. Hilborn, we would
21 probably support it.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. SAM: Thank you, Stanley.

24 While you're there, are there any
25 questions for Stanley Ned from the Councils?

26 Thank you, Stan.

27 Any further public comments,
28 questions? On 02-025?

29 If not, we shall go on to 02-069.

30 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
31 this is development of a shared AYK
32 fisheries database. Again, this is a
33 continuation project of a previously funded
34 FIS study looking at an AYK fisheries
35 database, and it was recommended for
36 funding.

37 I would entertain any questions
38 at this time.

39 MR. SAM: Yes. I personally am
40 just wondering why do we need this at all
41 because we already signed an agreement, MOA
42 with the State. Is this a different one
43 from the MOA signed from the State?

44 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
45 yes. This is developing a fisheries
46 database for the AYK regions to collect

1 subsistence data -- collect and standardize,
2 I guess, format of subsistence data, review
3 old subsistence data and error-check it and
4 develop computer programs for the entering
5 of new data so that it would all be
6 consistent and readily available.

7 It's a prototype project.

8 MR. SAM: Wasn't there --
9 wouldn't we be duplicating information
10 because if I remember, a part of that MOA
11 that we share all information, or is this so
12 totally different?

13 Rich?

14 MR. CANNON: I think, you know,
15 the MOA is an agreement to share
16 information, that that's a good thing to do
17 and there's willingness to do that. This
18 project and others like it are actually a
19 way about doing that, actually carrying that
20 out so that -- and this project is actually
21 an extension of some existing work with the
22 Department of Fish & Game who are trying to
23 make their information more available to all
24 of the users, all of the Federal managers,
25 Tribal groups in the AYK region.

The Fish & Game in that region
has been collecting data since statehood,
and they haven't had a lot of funds to put
this information into a form that's readily
available for other people to use. And so
that's what -- the intent of this project.

MR. SAM: Any further questions
for Rich Cannon or Cliff on 02-069?

Vince?

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I
need to ask the staff there, since these are
interregional projects; have other Regional
Councils taken these up, and if they have,
have they made any recommendations on these
three projects?

MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, the
other Councils are taking these up, and I
believe that in this case that this one was
accepted by the other Councils in the AYK
region.

1 MR. SAM: Any further questions?
2 Go ahead.

3 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chairman, I did
4 want to comment on the 02-025 when we had an
opportunity.

5 MR. SAM: Are you going back to
6 02 --

7 MS. GREGORY: 025.

8 MR. SAM: So you are requesting
9 to speak on 02-025?

10 MR. KLEIN: Yes, I just wanted to
11 bring up a couple of issues there before you
describe -- before your final deliberations.

12 MR. SAM: State your name again,
13 for the record.

14 MR. KLEIN: Steve Klein. I'm the
15 chief of Fisheries Information Services
16 responsible for the Fisheries Monitoring
17 Program before you.

18 MR. SAM: When we go into
19 deliberation on 02-025, we'll call you back.
20 Any further questions or concerns
21 on 02-069?
22 Jack?

23 MR. REAKOFF: So, basically this
24 069 proposal would provide an interface
25 between the State of Alaska and the Federal
Government's data. The flow would be
readily available to both agencies and other
agencies also?

26 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Yes,
27 Mr. Reakoff, that is my understanding. This
28 project is not only trying to standardize
29 the format for subsistence information data
30 into a centralized database, but also to
31 make this more accessible to all
32 individuals; Tribal, local, and whoever
33 requires this kind of information for
34 in-season management or whatever.

1

MR. SAM: Jack?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. REAKOFF: I'm very in favor of that. I feel that there has been too many people talking to themselves and not enough sharing of this information between the different agencies. So I'm in favor of this proposal.

MR. SAM: Any further questions, because I too am in favor of 02-069 from information that I've gathered from different agencies and different people is that you could see it, because from our side, from our side, the Federal side, all the information, all our offices, all our meetings are wide open, and as far as the stateside, they seem pretty closed, and they seem to be closing their doors, and it's rather hard to get information from their side at times.

Any further questions for Rich or Cliff?

Anymore public input?

If not, let's go into 02-071.

MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman, the strategy for assessing release mortality of sport-caught fish in Western and Interior Alaska; I understand that I may have misrepresented this project earlier when I discussed it with you. It is not just a literary search for information on hooking mortality in fish. There is also another component of the study that will develop a working group to review that and make recommendations for a management strategy.

I just wanted to make that point clear, that there was another component of this study that I didn't make clear earlier.

But this project was not recommended for funding, so I'll entertain any questions at this time.

MR. SAM: Questions from the three Councils for Cliff?
Gerald?

MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, I'd just

1 like to point out that since it's the salmon
2 that most of these three Councils, these
3 people represent, depend on so heavily, last
4 year we were cut off pretty abundantly and
5 we never got our salmon and we do depend
6 heavily on other freshwater species, and
7 it's very sad to see when you go up some of
8 these creeks and see some of these fish that
9 have been released and you see hook marks in
10 the mouth. You can't eat that fish because
11 it's already spoiled. I'd like to see
12 something done about that. From the Yukon,
13 where it crosses the water, we really depend
14 on these freshwater species. It's a good
15 project, and I think something has to be
16 done about it. Something has to be done,
17 bluntly told to the sport fishings, what I
18 think they're actually doing is just
19 catching and releasing the fish and playing
20 with the food that our creator gave to us.

21 MR. SAM: Thank you, Gerald. Any
22 further questions or comments on 02-071?
23 Go ahead.

24 MR. CHURCH: The area -- are the
25 area that you're planning on doing most of
26 the study and reports that you're planning
27 on putting together, you said earlier when
28 we reviewed the same proposal that a lot of
29 information is going to be coming from the
30 Lower 48, studies that have been done on
31 other species of fish. What portion of the
32 reports will be coming from Alaskan waters
33 and Alaskan studies?

34 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
35 that is what this study is basically trying
36 to do is to compile all the information that
37 is in the literature currently on hooking
38 mortality in fish, and centralize it and
39 synthesize it, actually develop like an
40 executive summary of this information, then
41 bring it to a forum of managers and
42 subsistence users to develop management
43 strategies and perhaps identify, you know,
44 projects for research or identify needs for
45 research.

46 It's just basically a forum to
47 see what's out there, how it applies to also

1 Alaska since not a lot of work has been done
2 in Alaska, and try and make some management
decisions and planning out of it.

3 MR. CHURCH: One more comment.
4 You know, since the issue of
catch-and-release is a very controversial
5 and also a very sensitive issue in our
Native communities, I think the research
6 won't be important to maybe bring to a close
what the really effects are on a lot of our
7 freshwater fish that are out in your rivers
and also on our migrating salmon species,
8 and maybe -- it's maybe beneficial to all
Native groups out in our area.

9 MR. SAM: Did you want to
10 respond?

11 MR. SCHLEUSNER: I agree. It is
an identified need and it has been an
12 identified need, and this is an organized
approach to look at the issue and try to
13 come up with some management
recommendations. It was a project. It was
14 just a funding constraint, again.

15 MR. SAM: Ray Collins?

16 MR. COLLINS: I'd just like to
comment that this seems like an important
17 first step in that process. We wanted the
issue looked at, and if you're going to look
18 at the issue, one of the things you need to
establish is what do we already know about
hook and release, and also the component
19 that we missed earlier, wasn't coming in, I
think it's important; they'll be
20 recommending, what should we do with this
information in Alaska; what kind of studies
21 do we need here to address the problem. It
looks like this would be a first step to
22 meeting the priority that we already set
before.

23

24 MR. SAM: Thank you, Ray.
Any further questions?
Carl?

25

MR. MORGAN: Yeah, thank you,

1 Mr. Chairman. I guess earlier we passed and
2 we approved the study on mortality rate on
3 live bait, which they handle with very care,
4 professional and there's some mortality
5 rate. These salmon are not -- these
6 catch-and-releases are not only -- our
7 Native fish that stays here year-around,
8 they're also required to release --
9 catch-and-release chum, chinook, and these
10 people are fighting with these fish.
11 They're not handling them very carefully.
12 So I think this is very important step.
13 We've already got a study that they want to
14 do mortality rate on tagging and they say
15 this was as high as 07 percent and they said
16 that they handle these fish very
17 professionally, very carefully, and with the
18 least shock as possible.

19 Thank you.

20 MR. SAM: Thank you, Carl.

21 I have one question, then, for
22 one of you.

23 Strategy for assessing release,
24 that would come -- wouldn't that come under
25 some fishery database, too? Couldn't we
show that into 02-069? You got to develop
that anyway?

15 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
16 this is a project that is funded by totally
17 different people, looking at totally
18 different issues. The shared database is
19 looking at collecting subsistence data.
20 This is actually looking at literature
21 review and developing a working group.

22 MR. SAM: Okay. Thank you for
23 that clarification.

24 Anymore questions from the
25 Councils for Cliff or Richard?
Jack?

26 MR. REAKOFF: I understand the
27 funding constraints, why this didn't pass,
28 but I would like the Board to understand
29 that this is still a very high priority, at
30 least from the Western Interior, my position
31 here. I feel that this is -- this problem
32 is going to be escalating in the future, and

1 that this is going to be very instrumental
2 data for management of the -- of all stocks,
3 but especially the freshwater stocks.

4 MR. SAM: Thank you, Jack.

5 As you all know, too, that we
6 are -- we did establish a working group to
7 study this. To what extent, I do not know.
8 Because of all the high concerns expressed
9 in that area.

10 Could you incorporate this or
11 would this have to be a totally new
12 proposal? Because it's 59,000. That's
13 quite a bit.

14 Rich?

15 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, maybe
16 this would help as you're deliberating this.

17 There are a number of other
18 regions that also have a strong interest in
19 this, and as I see this project, the
20 literature search is a small part of it.

21 The bigger -- certainly, the
22 bigger part of it is establishing a dialogue
23 among people, communities and different
24 areas of AYK who are interested in this
25 subject; to not have just one group of
26 people, Fish & Game folks, having their
27 information and their opinions, but sharing
28 that information so that you understand why
29 they feel the way they do about this
30 subject.

31 And then they're going to listen
32 too, and then other people will have an
33 opportunity in the communities to share
34 their perspectives. From this, I hope we
35 get better studies of and a better
36 understanding of the issue.

37 Part of the reason for the cost
38 is this would happen not only --
39 inter-regional project, it would happen in
40 the Kotzebue area, Nome area, as well as the
41 Yukon and Kuskokwim.

42 MR. SAM: Thank you, Lester.

43 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Pardon
44 me, Mr. Chairman, if you would go back to
45 the proposal under the objectives, and have
46 somebody read that, I think that -- since we

1 work with paper and what they give us on
2 paper, it would explain just exactly what
3 this is about.

3 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
4 it's on page 65 of your books. Objective
5 No. 1: Coalesce the available scientific
6 studies concerning the effects of
7 catch-and-release on fish and assess their
8 reliability and applicability to Alaskan
9 fisheries.

10 No. two: Produce a
11 catch-and-release database of these studies
12 on the Internet, including references,
13 comments on reliability and applicability to
14 Alaskan fisheries and links to each study.

15 Three: Make specific
16 recommendations to State and Federal
17 agencies for interpreting and using existing
18 information for establishing protocols for
19 conducting studies, and for conducting any
20 needed studies.

21 MR. SAM: Gerald?

22 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, I'd like to
23 entertain a motion to -- I'd like to
24 introduce a motion to accept 02-069 and also
25 02-071, but the thing about 02-071 to keep
it within the budget, subtract 13.3, so it
would be equal with 02-025, and omit 02-025
from this block.

MS. GREGORY: Second.

MR. SAM: There is a motion and
the second on the floor.
Any further discussion?
Ida Hildebrand?

MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman, I was just going to remind you
that Mr. Klein asked to be heard on this
proposal, 025 before you went into your
deliberations.

MR. SAM: Yes, I remember that.
Maybe that is our deliberation
completely -- go ahead -- Mr. Klein.

1 MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman, and Ida.

2 I just wanted to respond to some
3 of the concerns brought up by Mr. Ned, and
4 actually the Technical Review Committee
5 shared some of these same concerns. I did
6 want to address the reputation of
7 Dr. Hilborn, and I think there is some
8 animosity because he has represented Area M.
9 But for the record I would like to point out
10 that Dr. Hilborn is probably one of the best
11 quantitative fishery scientists in the
12 world. He's published on hatchery wild
13 interactions population monitoring and
14 population dynamics, so he's -- he is one of
15 the most highly thought of quantitative
16 scientists, I think, out there.

17 The concern about having a
18 broader coalition, the TRC -- this isn't
19 just a Ray Hilborn proposal, it also has
20 University of Alaska, Juneau. It also has
21 Alaska Department of Fish & Game on it and
22 also the TRC recommended that somebody from
23 Federal management be represented and that
24 might be somebody from my staff or somebody
25 from the Fish & Wildlife Service, but there
26 was a leaning towards having a broader
27 group, and there could be -- there's other
28 people in academics that could be
29 represented on that team.

30 The TRC did recognize it. I
31 wanted to bring those issues up, and to me
32 BEGs is something we should be addressing.
33 It is some of the most important things we
34 could do and I think Mr. Ned brought that
35 up. I would hate to see that fall by the
36 wayside and here's a chance to make some
37 progress on escapement goals and ensuring
38 we're sustaining subsistence harvest as
39 well, and if we can move forward with a
40 broader representation, I think might be a
41 wiser track. We want to hear from the
42 Regional Advisory Councils on your opinions,
43 but I would really hate to see this fall off
44 the table.

45 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46 MR. SAM: Thank you, Mr. Klein.
47 I too believe that this is
48 important, whether it be fish or game. We

1 always look at sustainable subsistence
harvest, sustainable yield issue.

2 And at this time, my feelings are
3 mixed. That's why I'm asking for more
4 deliberations or more questions or more
5 comments on the motion on the floor.

6 Are there any other ones?
7 Jack?

8 MR. REAKOFF: Is it my
9 understanding that you would be willing to
10 entertain the seating of Tanana Chiefs or
11 Native organizations on the panel
12 overseeing this -- these BEG levels?

13 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair, and
14 Mr. Reakoff, I think having those interests
15 represented would add value. It is a
16 population modeling exercise, but I think,
17 you know, they're going to be crunching a
18 lot of numbers; but in terms of the scope,
19 having representation from TCC that would be
20 very beneficial to the group. We need some
21 local involvement, and I think that would be
22 very beneficial.

23 MR. NICHOLIA: Mr. Chair?

24 MR. SAM: Gerald?

25 MR. NICHOLIA: We have a very
strong statement here from three distinct
regional nonprofits organizations, from
Kawerak, AVCP and Tanana Chiefs that
adamantly don't like this because of a
certain deal that we have been fighting for
ever since I was on this -- involved with
this Federal program. We always seem to run
into this guy head-on, and what makes you
think that he's just going to jump on this
side, our side just like that, for money or
for special interest? There's something
else involved in this.

MR. SAM: Response?

MR. KLEIN: Well, again, I want
to say that Dr. Hilborn is a well-respected
scientist. I mean, if you're going to knock
down any study with his name on it, then

1 perhaps we shouldn't go down that path.
2 Personally, I think he's well-respected and
3 he would be of immense value to sort through
4 sustainable harvest, and -- to me a broader
5 constituent base, a broader representation
6 would try to say that the results are
7 unbiased. I don't disagree that we want
8 unbiased science, Gerald. Everybody in this
9 room does want unbiased science.

10 MR. SAM: Lester?

11 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.:
12 Mr. Chairman, I think all of us sitting on
13 the table know that when there's a proposal
14 before us and it's passed and at times we
15 make suggestions to the people that respect
16 entertaining the proposal to make certain
17 changes and they've always stated that yes
18 this could or yes that could be done; but
19 then when it actually comes down to the
20 initiation of the proposal, it goes down
21 to -- the paper said the project said it was
22 going to be done this way, and this is
23 not -- and that entertain of any kind of
24 suggestion is not calculated within the
25 budget or stated in the proposal.

And if there's any -- anything
that's being said concerning this proposal,
it should be entertained within the motion
or the proposal itself.

Understand what I'm trying to
say?

MR. SAM: Not quite.

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: If you
don't understand English, I can say it in
Yupik.

(Laughter.)

MR. SAM: Lester?

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: What I
was just trying to say is if there is
anything being said that, yes, that certain
items can be interjected into this proposal
as written, that it be done so before it is
brought to us so that there will be no

1 excuse at a later date that it was not part
2 of the proposal.

3 MR. SAM: Thank you, Lester.
4 We do have a motion -- a second
5 motion on the floor which excluded 02-025.
6 Any further discussions?
7 Taylor Brelsford?

8 MR. BRELSFORD: Thank you very
9 much, Mr. Chairman. My name is Taylor
10 Brelsford, and I serve on the Technical
11 Review Committee that has looked at the
12 scientific basis of the studies. I
13 generally worked with the social science
14 studies, but in one instance one of the
15 projects before you was discussed very
16 thoroughly from the social science
17 standpoint as well. And that's Project
18 No. 71 addressing the question of
19 hook-and-release mortality.

20 I'd like to say, first, that all
21 of the Technical Review Committee recognize
22 that this is an urgent and a very serious
23 issue in the eyes of local communities.
24 There is no doubt about the significance and
25 the importance of learning more and of
26 listening well with local communities,
27 reaching some kind of better management
28 approach to hook-and-release fisheries.

29 That message has come through
30 loud and clear in Regional Council after
31 Regional Council.

32 There was several hundred
33 thousand dollars worth of research in the
34 Kotzebue area proposed in addition to this
35 project. That's nearly a quarter of a
36 million dollars over several years. These
37 are significant, expensive projects, and we
38 want to do it right. We want to plan
39 carefully and go about it one step at a
40 time.

41 On this particular project, there
42 were some concerns about how the various
43 agencies could work together on it. I think
44 most of us think this is a very good idea to
45 learn what's out there, to critically look
46 at the results, current science, and then
47 identify some new projects with our
48 stakeholders in these dialogues with local

1 communities. That's a very good idea, but
2 we want to go about it in an effective way.
3 And we were concerned that the current
4 project doesn't have some of the same -- the
5 organizations involved now that need to be
6 involved in a working group, in a major
7 project looking at hook-and-release
8 mortality.

9 So, the judgment of the Technical
10 Committee was that this one's not quite
11 ready for showtime, not ready for prime
12 time, that we need a little more
13 organizational homework before we ask the
14 Regional Councils and the local communities
15 to participate in it.

16 So, the recommendation from the
17 Technical Committee is to postpone to a
18 later date this working group and a
19 comprehensive review of catch-and-release
20 literature; not to drop the idea, but to
21 strengthen the organization and the
22 participation in it.

23 I wanted you to be sure and
24 understand that we realize how significant
25 an issue this is, and the concern of the
26 Technical Committee in recommending
27 postponement was to get a good, strong
28 project, to have good foundations, not to
29 ignore or look away from this important
30 issue.

31 Thank you.

32 MR. SAM: Gerald?

33 MR. NICHOLIA: Taylor, I could
34 say this just for 02-025 project, too. It
35 should have had some Tribal input before it
36 should have -- could have gone this far
37 ahead, you know. And, yeah, biological
38 escapement goals should have been set 20, 30
39 years ago, but I think this
40 catch-and-release right now is more
41 important than trying to set a biological
42 escapement goal in declining salmon stocks.
43 Right now what we're trying to do is trying
44 to protect -- we lose out on this ocean
45 species of salmon, we're left for the
46 freshwater species we've got to do something
47 now before it's too late. I think next year
48 it will probably be too late.

1
2 MR. SAM: Any further comments,
3 questions?

4 We do have a motion, and a
5 seconded motion on the floor.
6 Any further discussion?

7
8 MR. MOSES: I'm hoping sitting
9 with you guys, and I'm in this meeting -- at
10 our land, and we don't like sport fishing
11 even though they'd like to sport fish on our
12 land, we say no, and I know --

13 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: He knows
14 about Quinhagak. They accepted the sport
15 fishing and now Quinhagak doesn't like the
16 treatment of sport fishermen being there.
17 He was talking about fishing yesterday that
18 they're not allowed to play with the fish
19 and that's what the Elders had said a long
20 time ago.

21 MR. MOSES: And the first day
22 here's that sport fishermen. They quit
23 doing that a long time ago, because we poor
24 Yupik people, even though we say something
25 when they don't want to listen, they don't
listen to what we say. And even though we
do what they say, they say the -- the Fish &
Game say that they're going to do what we
say but it's not true, and they will have
another meeting with the Fish & Game, that
it's uncomfortable for us. We're not
comfortable with the sport fishing, and
we'll hear about this and it will still be
the same.

And this hook, fishing hook, if
it goes into our skin, and our hand, and
when we try to remove it, it will be -- it
will be cutting our hand. When it goes
first, it's okay; but when we try to take it
out it's uncomfortable and it hurts. And I
see on TV, I don't like what they do, that
the people are laughing, taking the fish and
then the fish swim away. After they're
swimming, they'll be hurt.

And then they come and they pay
to fish. They will come. They can fish,
sport fish, because they pay. It's all
about money. If it was free, they would not

1 allow them to sport fish. That's what I
2 think.

3 And I don't -- I want everybody
4 hear this, even though I'm here at the
5 meeting next year, they be talking about the
6 same thing that they won't like it, and at
7 Quinhagak, the two people came yesterday and
8 talked about that, that they didn't like it.
9 And they don't like the sport fishermen, and
10 they're not the only ones. And the other
11 people don't like it as well.

12 And I'd like to talk about that.
13 And I said something about that yesterday
14 too.

15 And we should all think together,
16 we'd be more happier with the Fish & Game if
17 they do what we think.

18 We should all think together and
19 even though what we say, even if they don't
20 like it, we'd be thankful for that.

21 But what they want, even though
22 we don't like it, we Yupik people, even
23 though -- if they don't want to make that a
24 permit, they won't do it. And from a long
25 ways back, they say not to play with the
26 fish.

27
28 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: And he's
29 saying the same thing that he did before.

30 MR. MOSES: And we don't have
31 much in our home. But where they sport
32 fish, they don't like that because that's
33 their food. And in the different villages,
34 we eat different foods because we live in
35 the different places because we're Yupik
36 people and the food, when they tell the Fish
37 & Game they don't really like that, and it's
38 very important to them. You should respect
39 them, the people that they eat at their own
40 land. And if they don't want that -- if the
41 people that live there, if they don't want
42 that, they're not supposed to touch that.

43 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: And that's
44 all he's got to say.

45 MR. SAM: Thank you, Phillip.
46 Again, we do have a motion on the
47 floor.

1 What's the pleasure of the
2 Councils?

3 Call for question.

4 MS. GREGORY: Yes.

5 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Question.

6 MR. NICHOLIA: I made the motion
7 to accept 02-06 as it is and 02-07 with the
8 stipulation of subtracting 13.3 from the
9 figure of the 02-071 budget so it would not
10 go overbudget in the interregional fisheries
11 monitoring proposals. So it will be the
12 same budget, so it would not go overbudget
13 of one block here.

14 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.:
15 Mr. Chairman?

16 MR. SAM: Harry?

17 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: How's the
18 motion read?

19 MR. SAM: You have that
20 transcribed because I'm getting it a little
21 bit slow.

22 (Motion read by the reporter.)

23 MR. SAM: You want the first one?
24 Can you retract a little bit?

25 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, now
26 that the motion is cleared and all that, I
27 think it would be wise for the Council to
28 ask, since you are subtracting amount of
29 money from that project, can that project
30 meet the goals that you are seeking from
31 that, so you're not later finding out that
32 the subtraction of 13,000, et cetera,
33 doesn't allow that project to function to
34 the level that you wanted it.

35 MR. SAM: Cliff or Rich?

36 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman, I
37 can't really speak to whether or not the
38 project would be able to go forward,
39 subtracting from the budget without talking

1 to the principal investigators.

2 MR. SAM: Mr. Klein?
3 Who are the investigators?

4 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chair, to
5 me, rather than jockeying amounts around
6 between projects that what the Board and
7 the -- really wants to hear is which
8 projects you support with close to the
9 budget target there, and 13,000 one way or
10 another, I think you ought to -- if you're
11 supportive of the projects, that's the way
12 you ought to vote and not be too concerned
13 about \$13,000 amounts.

14 MR. SAM: Gerald, did you have
15 something?

16 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, it was my
17 intention to get this Kuskokwim study to get
18 started anyway, if we're so concerned with
19 freshwater species.

20 MR. SAM: Any further discussion?
21 Jack?

22 MR. REAKOFF: If the 071 proposal
23 was to go through, could the -- or the way
24 it was written be changed slightly to
25 address the issues that the Technical Review
Committee had with that proposal?

MR. KLEIN: Mr. Chair,
Mr. Reakoff, we can -- when we develop the
final cooperative agreements to implement
this, we can accommodate changes. I'm
looking more closely at the project. There
is a big problem in 2003 -- excuse me -- in
the year 2003, that project 02-071, it does
have a budget of 190 -- 187,000, and for the
two projects -- well, and the amount
available in 2003 is 159,000, so -- that's
about 30,000 over the budget, and that
probably would be cutting into your amount
of funding next year.

24 And then on top of that, you're
25 going overbudget this year.

You're getting into some large
enough amounts overbudget, 13,000 is one

1 thing. You're talking 30,000 this year --
2 or 30,000 in 2003 and with the projects you
3 selected in 2002, you're about another
4 22,000 over. We're getting into some larger
5 amounts where the money isn't growing on
6 trees, and the Board's going to say
7 something is going to have to go. You might
8 want to prioritize which two studies are
9 most important to you and the Board could
10 use that in their deliberations.

11 Mr. Chair?

12 MR. SAM: Yeah, thank you.

13 I'd still like to call Stanley
14 Ned up to the chair, because I have a
15 question for him which may tilt my vote one
16 way or the other.

17 So, again, earlier you stated
18 that you were willing to make some
19 concessions on 02-025. Can you put them on
20 the floor or not?

21 MR. NED: No, I can't without
22 going back to the regional corporations.

23 MR. SAM: Okay. Thank you. That
24 was my only question.

25 Any further discussion?
26 John, then David.

27 MR. HANSON: Thank you,
28 Mr. Chairman. A lot of us may be confused
29 that we're voting on the two bold and one
30 light. I think what we should do is we're
31 going to -- if we're going to vote down 025,
32 I think we should vote that down first, and
33 then 069 and then 071. After we vote on
34 025, which might be -- we've got this letter
35 that has three organizations that don't want
36 it. Might as well just go vote 025 first,
37 and then that funding maybe could go into
38 071 or half of it go to 071 and half of
39 it --

40 MR. SAM: Again, we're not
41 exactly -- if we cannot get all the answers
42 on 02-025, I don't think we could vote on it
43 anyway, because I -- there's got to be
44 consensus from everybody about this letter
45 before us, we can't do anything. We have

1 the motion on the floor, so without the
2 withdraw from the maker of the motion and
the seconder, we cannot retract at this time
either.

3 Mr. Chairman?
Ray?

4
MR. COLLINS: I think the
5 original motion that we have on the floor
now, it has in the words there to delete
6 that one and support the other two, so it
does everything that you wanted done, John,
7 but in one motion, I think. So you are
voting against that. You're voting to
8 delete it and you're voting to support the
other two by the support of the motion on
9 the floor right now.

10 MR. SAM: I understand that.

11 MR. HANSON: Yeah, I understand
that.

12
MR. SAM: Would that be
13 acceptable, if we go ahead with the motion?
Are you willing or ready to take
14 action with that understanding that we
address all three under the original motion?

15
MR. HANSON: (Nods head.)

16
MR. SAM: Jack?

17
MR. REAKOFF: My problem with
18 this motion is that -- by bringing this
first year down to 45,000 on the mortality
19 study, I'm not sure that that's going to
accomplish what we want it to. I think this
20 whole thing brings real questions to my
mind.

21
MR. NICHOLIA: They said not to
22 worry about the 13 --

23
MR. REAKOFF: The next year, you
start to worry about this 180-thousand --

24
MR. NICHOLIA: What I wanted it
25 to do is I wanted to -- what I wanted to do
is I wanted to get this thing started.

1 We've been talking about this for the last
2 for five years. Now it's time to do
3 something about it no matter what the
4 funding is going to be the next year or the
5 year after that.

6 Let them know -- let this Board
7 know what we want and what we want to do.
8 We want to protect our subsistence resources
9 for our people that we represent.

10 MR. SAM: Any further discussion?
11 Stanley Ned, one more time.

12 MR. NED: I just want to make it
13 clear that the Board understands, we are
14 totally opposed to this. Thanks.

15 MR. SAM: Just for your
16 information, with the original motion we are
17 addressing this, so we are legally on the
18 floor.

19 Any further discussion?

20 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.:
21 Mr. Chairman?

22 MR. SAM: Lester?

23 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Call for
24 the motion.
25 Question.

MR. SAM: The Chair would request
a roll call vote on this.

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
Western Interior. Carl Morgan?

MR. MORGAN: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: Ron Sam?

MR. SAM: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: Benedict Jones?

MR. JONES: Yes.

MR. MATHEWS: Ray Collins?

1 MR. COLLINS: Yes.
2 Yes.
3 MR. MATHEWS: Jack Reakoff?
4 MR. REAKOFF: Yes.
5 MR. MATHEWS: Angela Demientieff?
6 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.
7 MR. MATHEWS: Sampson Henry?
8 MR. HENRY: Yes.
9 on Western MR. MATHEWS: Passed unanimously
 Interior.
 Yukon/Kuskokwim. Alvin Owletuck?
10 MR. OWLETUCK: Yes.
11 MR. MATHEWS: Lester Wilde?
12 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Yes.
13 MR. MATHEWS: Phillip Moses?
14 MR. MOSES: Yes.
15 MR. MATHEWS: James Charles?
16 MR. CHARLES: Yes.
17 MR. MATHEWS: Billy McCann?
18 MR. McCANN: Yes.
19 MR. MATHEWS: Willard Church?
20 MR. CHURCH: Yes.
21 MR. MATHEWS: Fritz George -- I'm
22 sorry, I apologize.
 Mary Gregory?
23 John Hanson?
24 MR. HANSON: Yes.
25 MR. MATHEWS: Harry Wilde?

1 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Yes.

2 MR. MATHEWS: Passes unanimously
3 for Yukon/Kuskokwim.
4 Eastern Interior. David James?

5 MR. JAMES: Yes.

6 MR. MATHEWS: Jim Wilde?

7 MR. JIM WILDE: Yes.

8 MR. MATHEWS: Gerald Nicholia?

9 MR. NICHOLIA: Yes.

10 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, all
11 three Councils by unanimous motion accept
12 the motion.

13 MR. SAM: Once again, united we
14 stand, we'll fall individually.

15 At this time, this concludes all
16 deliberation on proposed Yukon studies and
17 research and proposals; is that right?
18 Vince?

19 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I
20 think we've had a very productive discussion
21 on all these projects, and my statement is
22 no reflection on how productive that is. I
23 think it would be wise for the Councils to
24 revisit their agenda at this point. We have
25 some very important people that wanted to
share results from projects you approved in
2000, and 2001, and they need to catch
planes earlier this afternoon, so I'm asking
the Councils if they'd be willing to take up
Dr. Kocan's presentation on ichthyophonous,
and also Frank Charles is on that same
plane, and he's asking to speak and maybe
Cliff has an additional one.

MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman, we
still have two other projects to decide on,
the "Harvest Monitoring TEK Interregional."

MR. SAM: With the pleasure of
the Board, we'll go with Vince's
recommendation that we go ahead and listen

1 to Frank Charles and whoever the other
2 person -- was Richard Kocan.

3 Not right now. I'm getting
4 tired, so I'd like to go for a 15
5 minute-break, turn the Chair over to Gerald,
6 and -- is this acceptable to all Council
7 members, that we take Frank Charles and
8 Richard Kocan before we go back to
9 inter-regional deliberations?

10 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.:
11 Mr. Chairman, move to spin the rules to
12 include Frank Charles and Richard Kocan.

13 MR. SAM: Is there a second?

14 MS. GREGORY: Second.
15 All those in favor of the motion,
16 signify by saying "aye."

17 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

18 MR. SAM: Opposed, same sign.
19 Motion carries.

20 In a few minutes, we'll take up
21 Frank Charles and Richard Kocan.

22 (Break.)

23 MR. NICHOLIA: Richard, you can
24 go ahead and start there.

25 MR. KOCAN: Mr. Chairman, and
members of the Council, thank you very much
for having me here and allowing me to share
some of the information and knowledge that
I've gained over the last three years
working on the Yukon River. I'd like to
introduce at this time, my colleague
Dr. Paul Hershberger who has worked with me
on this project since 1999 and he'll also be
presenting some information.

The project that we've been
working on is a disease problem of Yukon
king salmon and the organism that causes
this disease is called ichthyophonous. It's
a small protozoan-type organism that infects
the tissues of this animal. Here's an
example of what you might see if you found
an infected fish on the river.

1 This is a heart of a king salmon,
2 and on it you can see these little white
3 speckles that looks like salt grains. These
4 are the organisms on the surface on the
5 heart. They also penetrate into the deep
6 part of the heart, and if you were to cut
7 this heart into a very thin slice and stain
8 it and put it on a microscope and look at
9 it, you would see this. This is the edge of
10 the heart. This is a normal heart muscle
11 right here?

12 This light-colored material, and
13 all of these dark round bodies are the
14 parasite and you can see there's a
15 tremendous amount of tissue damage to the
16 heart muscle here.

17 Now, if you could imagine, this
18 fish has this much tissue damage to its
19 heart, it's swimming a thousand miles or
20 more upstream, it's not feeding, and it's
21 pregnant while it's doing this. This is a
22 tremendous strain on this fish as it's
23 returning to its spawning streams.

24 If this were a condition that a
25 human had, they probably couldn't make it up
26 the stairs, yet this fish swims a
27 considerable distance with this condition.

28 The heart is the primary organ
29 that one sees affected when the disease
30 develops in these fish.

31 After the fish has gone upriver,
32 perhaps beyond Tanana, you start to see that
33 the disease spreads to other tissues, and
34 here you can see the disease spreading to
35 the liver. These white spots on the liver
36 are the same parasite.

37 It also spreads to the spleen and
38 the kidneys, and it spreads into the flesh
39 of the fish, and here you see these white
40 little things that look like rice grains,
41 these are also the parasite.

42 This is what first drew attention
43 to this organism by the fishermen along the
44 river. They noticed there were white spots
45 in the flesh and they noticed that the fish
46 that had white spots didn't cure properly
47 when they used the traditional drying and
48 smoking methods.

49 Oh, it's also possible -- it's
50 also another condition that one sees -- is

1 the fish when they first enter the river, do
2 not show any of these signs of disease. But
3 they are infected. That means, they have
4 some clinical disease or the parasite is
5 present, but in such a low level that it
6 doesn't cause a problem.

7 The problem only arises as the
8 fish move upstream, up the Yukon River, and
9 I'll show you how this develops.

10 The techniques we used to study
11 this over the past three years were to
12 collect fish either by gillnet or fishwheel.
13 We made observations of the internal organs
14 looking for signs of clinical disease. That
15 is the lesions that I just showed you. We
16 also did what are called explant cultures.
17 That is we did tissue cultures of the heart
18 and liver and spleen and muscle to see if we
19 could not get the organism to grow in
20 culture that way we could find infected fish
21 that had not yet shown size of disease.
22 These we classified as sub-clinical
23 infections.

24 We also examined the tissues
25 histologically, that is under a microscope,
to verify that indeed these little things
we're looking at were this particular
parasite, because several different
organisms cause the same types of white
spots.

26 In 1999 when we first did this
27 project, it was funded by the Bering Sea
28 Fishermen's Association. It was a very
29 limited study and it only lasted about a
30 week, and we looked at fish from Emmonak,
31 right here; and we looked at fish from
32 Tanana, right here. What we found right
33 here, that 30 percent of the fish entered
34 the river infected, virtually none of them
35 had any signs of disease.

36 When we looked at the same pulse
37 of fish here at Tanana we found that 25 to
38 30 percent of the fish showed signs of
39 disease which is essentially all of those
40 that were infected.

41 So, the study was then expanded
42 and funding came from the U.S. Fish &
43 Wildlife Service. In the year 2000, we
44 looked at sites at Tanana, Galena -- I mean
45 Emmonak, Galena, Tanana, Circle Dawson,

1 Whitehorse, and one site on the Tanana River
2 at Nenana.

3 This year, in 2001, we sampled
4 essentially all the same sites, except we
5 moved the Tanana River site from 20 miles
6 above Tanana to the mouth of the Tanana
7 River, then we sampled the Rampart-Rapids
8 and we sampled the mouth of the Chena River,
9 and we sampled spawned out fish in the Chena
10 River.

11 Okay. What did we find over the
12 years?

13 This graph shows the percent of
14 infected fish on this particular graph and
15 these are males and these are females. What
16 it shows you is that significantly more
17 females are infected than males. This is
18 interesting because we usually sample about
19 twice as many males as females.

20 This graph, again, shows the
21 number or the percent of infected fish on
22 this particular axis, and the top of these
23 bars represents all of the fish that are
24 infected and diseased, and it represents
25 both sexes combined.

The red portion of the graph, the
red bars represent just those that show
clinical disease or actually sick.

The blue portion shows the
percent of fish that are infected but do not
show any signs of disease.

As you can see, as they enter the
river at Emmonak and proceed to Galena,
about 2 percent of the fish show any signs
of disease. Disease increases up to 25
percent or so between Tanana, Circle and
Dawson; then drops quite drastically at
Whitehorse. You'll notice that the percent
of infected fish remains the same all the
way to Dawson, then drops dramatically at
Whitehorse. This is with both sexes
combined.

I want to show you what the sexes
look like separately, when you look at the
males and females.

These are diseased fish, clinical
scenes of disease, like the relation lesions
I showed you at the beginning, at Emmonak
and Galena, males and females show
relatively few signs of disease, by the time

1 they reach Tanana, Circle and Dawson, 25 to
2 30 percent of the females are infected and
about 20 percent of the males are infected.

3 Again, you see at Whitehorse,
4 when you separate the sexes, that there's a
drop in the number or the percent of
infected females.

5 This is also at Dawson,
6 Whitehorse, rather, is also the first time
that there are fewer diseased females than
males.

7 You notice in every case here
8 there are a lot more of the females infected
than there are males, diseased rather. If
9 you look at the infection, whether they show
clinical signs of disease; blue are males
10 and red are females. You see this line
right here, the blue one represents the mean
11 number of infected males and the red line is
the mean number of infected females, and you
12 see from Emmonak River mile 24 to
Whitehorse, river mile 1745. The males
13 remained relatively stable. There's a
slight decline as they move upriver, but not
very much.

14 The females you see remain
15 relatively high, up 30 to 40 percent
infected, and then drop down to around 9
percent when they reach Whitehorse.

16 Now, we had suggested that these
17 fish at Whitehorse, these females, may be
uninfected or not showing so many infected
fish because they died.

18 But a number of other people who
19 looked at the data suggested that, well,
maybe there are other reasons that there's
fewer infected fish here. Perhaps
20 Whitehorse being a hatchery situation wasn't
representative of the rest of the river.
21 Perhaps, the diseased fish swam up
tributaries before they reached Whitehorse.
22 Perhaps it was just a statistical anomaly
and that if we had done this again, that
23 these numbers at Whitehorse would be similar
to the rest of the river.

24 So, we addressed those issues
this year.

25 I want to add one thing here
before I move on to 2001.

This is the same graph -- okay.

1 This graph I just finished showing you shows
2 Emmonak, Galena, Tanana, Circle, Dawson,
3 Whitehorse. I'm going to insert in the next
graph the samples we took on the Tanana
River. I'm going to put them between Tanana
and Circle because of the river miles.

4 Here you see the Nenana samples
5 at river mile 860, part way between Tanana
and Circle in terms of distance that the
6 fish swam, if you notice, the males here
fall right in line with the males in the
7 rest of the sample of the river, but you'll
see that females dropped way below infection
8 levels that you see in female fish in the
rest of the river but look very much like
the ones we see at Whitehorse.

9 The only thing that we saw that
was similar between the Whitehorse fish and
10 the fish at Nenana is that both of them are
nearing the terminal spawning streams. That
11 was the only thing we could see that was
similar, and we suspected that whatever was
12 causing these fish or fewer infected fish to
appear there was probably similar for both
13 sites. So we examined that in 2001 to see
if we could sort this out.

14 Our conclusions from 2000 were
that ichthyophonus was present in about 30
15 percent of the fish returning to the Yukon
River. The clinical signs of diseased fish
16 were present in less than 6 percent when
they entered the river but rose to over 26
17 percent in the whole population as they
moved upriver, and that infection and the
18 disease both declined as the fish approached
the spawning areas.

19 Okay. This year, in order to
eliminate some of those variables that we
20 saw at Whitehorse, we took samples of fish
at the mouth of the Tanana River at
21 Corbousier Slough, where the Tanana River
enters to the Yukon. We took samples at
22 Fairbanks just below the mouth of the Chena
River, and then we sampled spawnouts, fish
23 that had spawned and were still sort of
flopping and drifting downstream after they
24 finished spawning.

25 What we found here, these are
diseased fish. We could see the clinical
signs in them. We saw at the mouth of the

1 Tanana we had about 15 to 20 percent
2 infected or diseased fish at Fairbanks just
3 below the Chena. We had again about 20 or
4 so to 30 percent infected fish. In the
5 Chena River, the males, we had about 9
6 percent infected fish or diseased fish and
7 no infected females. 30 fish we sampled,
8 females, and none of them showed any signs
9 of disease.

10 We thought perhaps the diseased
11 fish fell out of the population. We'll
12 looked for infected fish.

13 So we cultured the tissues of
14 these same fish and we found again that
15 about 30 percent of the fish were infected
16 at both the mouth of the river and at
17 Fairbanks and at the Chena River, none of
18 the females were infected.

19 Now, this led us to believe that
20 if these fish were infected at such high
21 levels in the Yukon and in the Tanana but
22 none of them showed up as spawners, that
23 these females were eliminated from that
24 population, probably through mortality
25 before they had a chance to spawn.

And I think this is a very
significant finding because this removes a
large portion of what is expected to be a
spawning population without any evidence of
them being missing.

I should point out in the
conclusions that you were all handed out --
handed a summary of the data up until now,
in the conclusions, as you might expect,
some errors occurred, and one of the errors
was that this particular conclusion that
these females were dying was not included.

You could pencil that in. I'll
be sure to include that in the final report
when it comes out.

Okay. Now, one of the -- one of
the questions that came up was perhaps we
had sampled the Chena River fish too early.
Maybe we got the beginning of the run, and
these were the healthy fish and that the
sick fish came in at the end of the run.
What we did to try and answer this question
is we went to the Rapids. If you'll look at
Figure One in that handout you had, you'll
see the catch-per-unit effort listed, and

1 you'll see two times in which we collected
2 fish at the Rapids, one sample period was
3 late June early July, and the other was late
4 July. This corresponded to the very
5 beginning of the run and the very end of the
6 run.

7 And we looked at the number of
8 infected fish that we found at the Rapids,
9 during the early run, and the number of
10 infected fish, both males and females in the
11 late run, and we found that there was, oh,
12 perhaps a slight increase in the number of
13 infected males, but no real difference
14 between the number of infected females early
15 and late. We also looked at diseased fish,
16 early and late in the -- at the Rapids, and
17 here you see that there's a slight increase
18 in the number of diseased fish here at the
19 late sample compared to the early sample;
20 but, again, there were a lot of diseased
21 fish, 15 to over 20 percent males and
22 females, and here 20 to 30 percent diseased
23 males and females.

24 And what this tells us is that
25 the early run fish, although they don't show
26 quite as much disease, they are infected
27 nonetheless.

28 So, if we sampled the early part
29 of the run of spawnouts, there should be
30 infected fish there. And we found none.

31 Which, again supports our
32 hypothesis that these fish are probably
33 dying. I should point out, we didn't
34 neglect the latter part of the run, we chose
35 people from ADF&G to collect samples from
36 the late part of the run. I had to move to
37 Dawson and Whitehorse to pick up the
38 samples. They collected a large number of
39 samples and they sent them to us Federal
40 Express. The last time we heard about them,
41 they were some place in Memphis, Tennessee,
42 and we never heard of them since. The data
43 we have is what we had, and the others
44 probably in the Internet, who knows.

45 I think if you look at Figure 5,
46 page 9 in your handout there -- when I say
47 diseased, that means at least one organ has
48 lesions on it and normally it's just the
49 heart.

50 The heart is the first or going

1 to show these white spot unless lesions are
2 in them.

3 As the run progresses, the
4 disease becomes more disseminated. That is,
5 it spreads to the other organs.

6 So, we looked at the other
7 organs, the organs that were affected during
8 the early part of the run and the late part
9 of the run. I think Figure 5 -- is that --
10 yeah, Figure 5, page 9 shows that the
11 disseminated disease, that is, where it's
12 gone beyond the heart, none of these fish
13 had disseminated disease. That is, the
14 heart was the only organ that showed any
15 signs of disease. While in the latter part
16 of the run, I don't have the thing with the
17 table with me, but it was 50 to 90 percent
18 of the fish -- 50 percent of the males and
19 90 percent of the females had disseminated
20 disease throughout their body. That's just
21 a matter of about three weeks' difference.

22 Now, this was supported by a
23 small study that the Canadians helped us
24 with. They did punch biopsies, that is,
25 they took little quarter-inch punches out of
the fillets of fish, just as they crossed
the border in Eagle. In the early part of
the run, they looked at 50 fish from the
early part of the run crossing the border,
and they found 10 percent of those fish to
have the parasite present in the muscle.

But when they sampled the late
portion of the run, another 50 fish, they
found 30 percent, or three times as many
fish had this organism now in the muscle
tissue. So, again, that substantiates what
we found at the Rapids that as the run
progresses, the disease spreads to more and
more organs and affects, in this particular
case, the flesh, which makes it partly
unusable.

Okay. Our hypothesis, which is
missing from the conclusions, is that the
ichthyophonous infected king salmon
actually -- the females actually died before
they reached the spawning streams, and I
believe this is true, primarily for the
Middle and Upper Yukon River. I think it's
possible into the lower river that, because
there's cooler temperatures and temperature

1 affects the growth of this organism, that
2 this may not be the case. For instance, in
3 the Koyukuk or the Andreafsky, this may not
4 be the situation, but we haven't sampled
5 them yet, but we're going to do it next
6 year.

7 The reason I say this is these
8 are temperatures taken at Pilot Station in
9 1999. You'll see here between the beginning
10 of June and the third week in June, the
11 temperatures range from about 9 degrees
12 Celsius and they shot up very quickly to 18
13 degrees Celsius. The opportunistic temp for
14 salmon is 8 to 12 degrees. Those samples
15 were traveling through the cooler part of
16 the water. Here in late July, 14th to the
17 late part of the July, you see the
18 temperatures are up to around 20 degrees.
19 That's almost lethal temperatures for
20 Salmonidae, you couldn't raise them at that
21 temperature in a hatchery.

22 We found it experimentally in the
23 literature -- you find that ichthyophonus is
24 much more lethal at high temperatures, than
25 low temperatures. As a matter of fact, the
5-degree difference will be the difference
between 100 percent survival and 100 percent
mortality.

Now, this supports the idea that
early-run fish and the late-run fish are
different in terms of the extensity of the
disease because the early-run fish
experience cooler waters while they were
moving in, while the late-run fish
experience warmer waters. We also noticed
in 1999 that that year was far more -- the
fish are far more severely diseased than
they did in 2000 and 2001. So we looked at
temperature that also were taken at the
Yukon Bridge, and you see here that in 1999
the temperatures were considerably higher
than they were in 2000, and that was the
year that we had the most severe disease of
the three years we looked. So, here, we
also see from year to year that the years of
high temperature show a much more severe
situation than the years of low temperature.
So, our hypothesis here is that the river
temperature affects how severe this disease
is and if this has been occurring over a

1 long period of time. It's possible that
2 this organism has always been present in
3 these fish, but had not been a problem. If
4 the Yukon temperature has risen, this could
5 account for why we see this disease now.

6 Another thing that we did, we
7 were trying to determine where these fish
8 became infected, and I should point out
9 we've worked for about 15 years on herring
10 and since 1992 during the big herring crash
11 in -- we've been working on ichthyohonus
12 between Puget Sound and Prince William Sound
13 during the entire coast there. We sampled
14 fish last year and this year, from here -- I
15 believe that's Kuskokwim Bay, and this year
16 from Norton Sound, and these were herring,
17 and the site that also we selected were also
18 in a map in that handout that you had. Than
19 is the first time that we have ever found a
20 herring population that had no ichthyohonus
21 in it, yet we were convinced that
22 ichthyohonus was being transmitted to these
23 fish by eating infected herring. What we
24 concluded was that these Yukon River fish,
25 if they are indeed being infected -- getting
their infection by eating the herring,
they're not getting it from eating fish in
the Bering Sea. They have to go someplace
else from there. My colleague, Paul
Hershberger will take over and explain to
you on what our views are, where they might
be taking this up, why there might be a
consistent 25 to 30 percent infection level
in the fish each year.

18 When -- you want to ask a
19 question now?

20 MR. HENRY: I was going to ask
21 about the water temperature. Can an
22 uneducated person like myself, what's the
23 temperature between Celsius and Fahrenheit?

24 MR. KOCAN: If you look in that
25 hand out, I think I put the Fahrenheit
equivalents right next to the Celsius
temperatures. So, 20 degrees like about 68
degrees Fahrenheit, I think, in the text.

Yeah, I can't convert them in my
head either. In the laboratory, I think
Celsius and metric are very easy. Once I

1 leave the lab, I'm back on miles and inches
2 and feet.

3 Paul?

4 MR. HERSHBERGER: Thanks.

5 MR. NICHOLIA: Hold on, got
6 another question for you over here.

7 MR. McCANN: Is it -- would it be
8 harmful to the people to eat if they don't
9 know about it, something like that?

10 MR. KOCAN: No, there's no public
11 health risk here at all. This is entirely a
12 fish disease problem. There are some
13 organisms related to this that do cause
14 diseases in humans, but they occur in
15 southeast Asia and they're just genetically
16 related, but there's no harm at all to
17 anybody eating this fish or the flesh from
18 it.

19 If you cook it, it's perfectly
20 fine.

21 MR. McCANN: Another one, but
22 you -- sounds like you don't have no really
23 idea where that disease come from; is that
24 correct?

25 DR. KOCAN: Dr. Hershberger will
explain where we think it's coming from
right now. We think they're getting it from
infected herring, since the herring in the
Bering Sea are not infected we had to come
up for an explanation of how this happened,
and he'll explain that to you right now.

MR. McCANN: How about the brand
of disease, what exactly it is, chemical,
what kind of chemical causing that? Is that
a chemical or something else?

MR. HERSHBERGER: It's actually a
parasite, and it's very closely related to
several other fish parasites. Some found in
carp, some found in salmon down in the Puget
Sound, very closely related to a human
parasite called rhinosporidium, and causes

1 polyyps in the nose of people in third-World
2 countries, mostly India. It's actually a
3 parasite and you can see the organism with
4 your eye sometimes. It gets up about maybe
5 an eight of an inch -- not -- I'm thinking
6 metric, about 200 microns. A 5th after
7 millimeter, you can almost see it with your
8 eye.

9
10 MR. McCANN: Thank you.

11
12 MR. KOCAN: If you recall the
13 picture I showed of the heart, those little
14 specs that looked like salt grains, those
15 were actually individual parasites on the
16 surface of the fish's heart.

17
18 MR. COLLINS: I have a question
19 based on the mortality of those females;
20 what percentage of the salmon entering the
21 river are likely to die? How many spawning
22 females are we using, 5 percent, 10 percent?
23 Did you do any math on that to see?

24
25 DR. KOCAN: The only hard data we
26 have so far is from the Chena River. Based
27 on just that data, all of the females, that
28 is about 30 percent of them that were
29 infected, were dead.

30
31 MR. COLLINS: But how much of the
32 run would that represent? I mean, entering
33 the river, you see there were only percent
34 of the fish entering the river, what
35 percentage of that are females, what are we
36 losing between entering the river and
37 spawning area?

38
39 MR. KOCAN: I'm don't know that
40 all the spawning streams respond the way the
41 Chena did. If they all respond exactly the
42 same, you're going to lose 30 percent of the
43 females. Some of them lose all of them,
44 some lose half, some lose 10 percent
45 depending on the conditions. We'd have to
46 sample all of these streams to get an idea
47 and get a calculation. At this point, we
48 can only say the Chena is the worst case we
49 would have imagined, I wouldn't have guessed
50 it would be that way. There was no question

1 that there was a single infected female in
2 any of the spawners we've seen.

3 MR. HERSHBERGER: Mr. Chair, and
4 members of the Council, once again,
5 Dr. Kocan and I would like to thank you for
6 having us up here and also for changing your
7 schedule to allow us to fit in before we
8 flew back today.

9 I'm going to talk a little bit
10 about the parasite in herring, and it's not
11 directly related to what we've been doing
12 here on the Yukon. However, I think the
13 results that also we're finding are very
14 important. I think they can explain lot of
15 about where these chinook are becoming
16 infected.

17 This project was not funded by
18 this organization. It was funded by
19 Washington Sea Grant, but again, I think the
20 results are very important in understanding
21 what's happening on the Yukon.

22 Pacific herring are found pretty
23 much all along the Pacific Coast of North
24 America and they're a marine polaic fish.
25 They swim around in the middle of the water
26 column. It's very well demonstrated that
27 marine polaic fish in general, undergo these
28 large oscillations or large peaks and
29 valleys in their population size. Nobody
30 really knows why.

31 These are not our data, these are
32 data from some other researchers from
33 California, from some sardines and what
34 they've been able to demonstrate is that in
35 this population of sardines, the biomass
36 went up and down, up and down on about a
37 ten-year period, and what's interesting
38 about this data is that commercial fishing
39 on this particular stock did not start until
40 about 1920.

41 So, even prior to the onset of
42 commercial fishing, this population of
43 sardines underwent these large oscillations
44 in their population size.

45 Nobody knows why.

46 There was a really interesting
47 study that came out of Scotland in 1999 by a
48 researcher named Andy Hudson and it was
49 published in the science journal "Nature"

1 where we conclusively demonstrated for the
2 first time ever that a parasite -- this was
3 in a population of birds, caused population
oscillations very similar to this. This was
a roundworm parasite in worms -- or in
birds.

4 Now, we don't know whether
5 ichthyohonus can do the same thing. It's
6 very possible. We have some data that it
might be occurring in herring, but we
haven't been able to conclusively
demonstrate it yet.

7 These are Pacific herring taken
8 from Puget Sound and they look fairly normal
except when you look back towards the tail,
you see these little dark peppery spots.
9 These are ulcers where ichthyohonus has
migrated from the skeletal muscles out and
they form pustules, and the parasite is in
10 the pustules. It erupts through the skin
and it leaves back these black ulcers and it
escapes in the environment.

12 These are histoslides, just like
13 Dr. Kocan showed. These are the parasites
here, several different parasites. Here's
another one. There's five here. Typically
14 what we see with ichthyophonus, is that the
host, the fish heart all around, it walls
15 off the parasite and it keeps the parasite
from spreading under normal conditions.

16 Now, something, and we're not
17 sure what that something is, but something
causes the host to not be able to contain
this parasite anymore, and what happens is
18 it starts to ooze out. Here's where the
support initially was in this heart
19 histosection and it broke through that
granule on the wall, and you can actually
20 see it's kind of oozing its way out through
the heart out to the surface here.

21 All these were initially inside
22 here and something triggered them to move
out. We're not sure what that is, but it
could be like Dr. Kocan suggested, an
23 increase in temperature, maybe a shutdown in
the immune system.

24 We're not sure at this point.

25 This is what happens when we
throw ichthyohonus in culture. Dr. Kocan
and I have met a lot of these people in the

1 audience here along the river. We were
2 throwing our cultures, pieces of heart,
3 liver, in test tubes with some pink liquid
4 in it. When we do that, we get to the lab,
5 this is what we're looking for, all these
6 little dark spots here are ichthyophonus, and
7 it actually grew in our test tubes and
8 that's how we detect it.

9 Okay. So, this is Puget Sound
10 and basically the way herring populations
11 work in Puget Sound; the management agency
12 is called Washington Department of Fish &
13 Wildlife. They're in charge of managing the
14 herring resources, and herring spawn in all
15 these little different bays throughout the
16 Sound. Washington Fish & Wildlife
17 classifies each spawning population as a
18 distinct stock of herring.

19 Dick and I went around last year
20 and sampled herring from different stocks
21 throughout Puget Sound. What we saw is that
22 the prevalence of ichthyophonus ranged in
23 these different stocks anywhere from 17
24 percent down here to South Puget Sound up to
25 about 55 percent in Port Susan. And there
was no evident pattern, either
geographically, north to south, or
temporally based on when these things
spawned as to how this was going to fall
out.

So, what we did was we went and
combined all these fish and considered them
one big population and we teased them out
later based on their age and this is what we
saw. Among the youngest herring in Puget
Sound, about 12 percent were infected with
ichthyophonus. As the fish got older, the
incidents of this ichthyophonus increased
with the age of the fish up to about 60
percent in the oldest herring in Puget
Sound.

Now, what does that mean until
we're losing a lot of herring in Puget Sound
and we don't know where they're going. In
the 1970s the, the mean annual mortality for
herring in Puget Sound was about 20 percent.
In the last three or four years, the mean
annual mortality has been anywhere from 07
to 80 percent in Puget Sound. Most of the
mortality occurs among the oldest herring.

1 The used -- used to be the median range of
2 herring in Puget Sound is 50 years, now it's
3 three years. The fewer herring we see have
4 very high incidences of ichthyophonus.

5 The question you're asking is:
6 What does this mean to the Yukon River? If
7 you had asked Dick and me about two years
8 ago where we think these chinook salmon are
9 getting infected -- they're getting it from
10 eating herring. Every population of herring
11 we look at we see ichthyophonus. To give
12 you examples, there have been recurrent fish
13 gills in the United States, the first was
14 1913 to 1914. The east coast of Canada and
15 Newfoundland, where they lost 50 percent to
16 ichthyophonus. 1931 to 1932, another
17 epidemic.

18 Then in the early 1990s, over in
19 Norway, 100 percent of the herring in the
20 North Sea were infected and more fish died
21 in that fish kill than we have herring in
22 Puget Sound. They lost more fish than our
23 total population of herring in Puget Sound.

24 Now, getting back to the west
25 coast of the United States, we see
26 ichthyophonus all the way from Puget Sound
27 north. Some researchers have seen it all
28 along the coast of British Columbia. Ted
29 Marsh has seen it around Juneau. We were
30 involved in first describing it in Prince
31 William Sound in the mid-1990s.
32 Incidentally in Prince William Sound this
33 year, 30 percent of the fish were infected
34 with ichthyophonus, and 16 percent of them
35 were diseased. Other researchers have
36 always -- also found it on Kodiak Island.

37 From the Gulf of Alaska south,
38 we've seen ichthyophonus.

39 As Dick alluded to, last year we
40 had some herring shipped to us from Goodnews
41 Bay. We looked at 100 herring, not only did
42 we -- he didn't see clinical finds of
43 disease. We couldn't see the parasite.
44 This was the first population we ever looked
45 at anywhere where we couldn't find
46 ichthyophonus. We were kind of bashful
47 about it. We thought we did something
48 wrong, so we didn't say much. We thought
49 maybe there was something wrong with the
50 culture media or something. It turns out

1 that this year again, we had some more
2 herring shipped to us from Goodnews here,
3 and also from Unalakleet, a little farther
4 north, two batches, 100 fish, and we
5 couldn't find it in any of them.

6 What does this mean in terms of
7 where are these fish becoming infected on
8 the Yukon?

9 First, there's several
10 possibilities. The herring we got from
11 Norton Sound area were very large. It could
12 be that up in Norton Sound, only the small
13 herring are infected with ichthyohonus. We
14 don't know. More likely, and probably more
15 parsimoniously, we think -- the chinook
16 salmon from the Yukon River are going down
17 south of the Aleutian chains where there's a
18 very large reservoir of ichthyohonus in
19 herring and probably getting infected south
20 of the Aleutian chain and we'd like to
21 investigate that as part of our study for
22 next year.

23 DR. KOCAN: Open to questions,
24 ladies and gentlemen. We'll be glad to
25 field them.

26 MR. NICHOLIA: Benedict?

27 MR. JONES: This is Benedict
28 Jones. I don't know if you people notice in
29 '98, '99 and 2000 most parasite in the
30 chinook. It's those years in the latter
31 part of June, early part of July, there was
32 a lot of pollution that was coming in our
33 area. Is this when the salmons were coming
34 up the streams? These parcels they're
35 dropping out, especially right after it's
36 raining, this red -- if you travel on the
37 calm water on the Yukon River, just see a
38 red streak parcel on top of the water. Do
39 you know if this has anything to do with the
40 disease?

41 DR. KOCAN: As far as we know,
42 unless the pollution was so severe that it
43 would affect the immune system of the
44 salmon, it probably doesn't. The reason we
45 say that is that it possibly doesn't on the
46 Yukon is that in areas down in Puget Sound

1 area and southern British Columbia, we've
2 got some really polluted waters, some of the
3 streams there that had chinook salmon in
4 them in dry weather are composed of about 75
5 percent sewage effluent and it doesn't seem
6 to affect the health or anything of the
7 salmon down there.

8 Your river up here is fairly
9 clean. You could get some fallout
10 contaminants. I don't think it's affecting
11 the overall health of the fish coming into
12 the river.

13 I think more than likely it's the
14 temperature of the river that's causing this
15 disease to occur in these salmon.

16 MR. JONES: What other parcel is
17 coming out of the air after the rain?

18 DR. KOCAN: Really have no idea.
19 I'm sure there's somebody who has looked at
20 that, but we've had no experience in trying
21 to identify these.

22 MR. JONES: These parcels were
23 even showing up on the berries two years
24 ago.

25 DR. KOCAN: Perhaps one of the
agencies, like USGS that does monitoring on
the river would be able to give you an
answer to that, but we can't do it.

MR. MOSES: The salmon that was
on the board up there on the film and he's
watching with his eyes what he saw last
spring, his wife showed him four salmon, she
cut four salmon, and that their hometown,
the salmon because since they live in the
ocean, it came up before it went into the
waters -- into their fish water, and she cut
up the four fish and when she got done she
came in and said she didn't cut one fish
because it wasn't any good. And he said
that they just brought them in and that's
when they cut them up the same day. And he
was curious about the fish. It has a lot of
spot -- black spots on it. And he didn't
think anything of it. But he looked at it
as a bad fish. And he's never seen salmon

1 that looked like that. And his wife cut it,
2 but she could cut it -- she didn't cut it
3 all the way because it wasn't any good. And
4 they put it -- they threw it away because it
5 wasn't any good.

6 The fish was bad. And he
7 believes what they're saying, that's what's
8 going on with the salmon now. And he's
9 thinking today that they would not be the
10 only fish that get infected. The other fish
11 will get infected besides those salmon. And
12 he said in the future, things are going to
13 be less and less and when he was younger,
14 there was a lot of fish, and he thinks about
15 that. That they will get less and less and
16 our food will get less and less in the
17 future. And long time ago, the little
18 birds, they don't see those very often
19 anymore, and even though they don't hunt
20 them, even though they don't hunt them, why
21 are they -- why is there hardly anymore of
22 those small birds? And even the bigger
23 birds, are getting less and less to see.
24 That's what he thinks, that the salmon are
25 not going to be the only ones that get this
26 disease. And he thinks that besides the
27 salmon, other things are going to get
28 diseased.

29 Thank you.

30 MR. SAM: Lester?

31 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: In your
32 studies, where the ichthyohonus is affecting
33 the herring in the area, how does the
34 temperature compare to the temperature on
35 the river? Is there a possibility that
36 there is mortality between the time of
37 infection in warm water down in that area on
38 the -- where the fish are coming up?

39 MR. HERSHBERGER: If I understood
40 correctly, you're asking about herring, if
41 the temperature could be killing the herring
42 also?

43 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Well, if
44 your assumption was that king salmon ate the
45 herring in that area where the ichthyohonus
46 is prevalent, what does that -- it would

1 seem to me that they would die -- you'd have
2 a high mortality of king salmon in that area
3 also.

3 MR. HERSHBERGER: You're correct.
4 It is very possible that we could be losing
5 fish at sea due to this parasite, but we
6 have no evidence at this point. It's hard
7 enough to get a handle on where the fish are
8 going in the river. We haven't -- we
9 haven't been able to find any dead fish in
10 the ocean yet either.

11 MR. KOCAN: If you'll recall some
12 of the graphs I showed you, when the salmon
13 do enter the Yukon, very few show signs of
14 disease, but they become more diseased as
15 they move up the river. Now these may be
16 the survivors from what's died in the ocean.
17 Then they became sick when it's in the
18 river, or it's possible because of the low
19 temperatures at sea that they do become
20 infected, they may have done this forever.
21 Until they entered warm water, they don't
22 become sick. We don't know the answer to
23 that right now. All we know is from the
24 time they enter the river until they reach
25 their spawning streams what happens to them.

26 But we do know that this disease
27 becomes very bad and kills herring. They're
28 only at 86 or 08 degrees Celsius water,
29 which would be 40 degrees Fahrenheit. To
30 answer your question, they may die, but we
31 don't know. All we know for sure is that
32 they do get sick after the end of the river,
33 and that this disease does kill them or
34 probably kills them before they spawn.

35 MR. COLLINS: I have a question
36 that may be related to Lester's. If the
37 salmon -- if the herring in Puget Sound are
38 all infected, what about the chinooks in
39 Washington, do they carry the disease? Did
40 you look at the Kuskokwim here? Is it
41 absent in the Kuskokwim or is it is there
42 also?

43 MR. HERSHBERGER: We have
44 received some samples from the Kuskokwim.
45 We have seen the samples of the parasite.

1 We haven't received enough samples to give
2 you a prevalence. We only received 20
3 salmon. It isn't enough to give you a
4 prevalence. It is in the Kuskokwim.

5 Chinook salmon in the Puget
6 Sound, we have looked at Puget Sound and
7 haven't found them yet. We're batting our
8 heads against the wall and haven't figured
9 that out.

10 I have spoken to the scientist,
11 he's used one strain of ichthyophonus, and
12 he's challenged three or four different
13 types of chinook salmon. He found there are
14 different strains of chinook to the one
15 isolate. The most susceptible chinook was
16 the Canada chinook. Those are preliminary
17 data. They're not published yet, very
18 small, very few fish that he uses.

19 MR. CHURCH: I think everybody is
20 of the understanding that our rivers are
21 salmon-based ecosystems. Is there any
22 chance at all that the disease can be
23 diseased by other salmon, who use decaying
24 flesh and salmon eggs as food source, such
25 as rainbow trout, grayling, pike and other
salmon?

15 MR. KOCAN: This is an excellent
16 question. One of the features of this
17 parasite is that after the infected hosts
18 fish dies, this parasite begins to grow in
19 the dead tissue and it begins to also
20 produce support that can infect other fish.

21 Now, this isn't an accident. I
22 mean, nature doesn't waste it's time growing
23 organisms inside dead carcasses so they can
24 die also. This is going some place. We
25 don't know where it's going. We know
freshwater fish can be infected and die if
you feed them tissues from dead fish. We've
done these experiments with freshwater fish.
This has been a question that we've been
muscling over for the last several years.
As these kings die and their bodies decay
and scavengers eat them, are they being --
is the organism being spread to fresh- water
species? We haven't had the opportunity to
look at any yet. We don't know. It would
be worthwhile testing, for instance trout or

1 grayling, whitefish, burbot, whatever is in
2 the river that might eat these things and
3 find out if indeed they are susceptible to
4 this parasite. Because something is
5 happening to these organisms after that fish
6 dies and it strikes us that it's probably
7 infecting somebody in the freshwater.

8 MR. NICHOLIA: Go ahead, Lester.

9 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: In your
10 studies, did you find out what exactly the
11 Yukon salmon were eating, what was the
12 contents of their stomach? Was that
13 primarily herring?

14 MR. KOCAN: When they are in the
15 Yukon, they don't eat anything.

16 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: I mean,
17 when they enter the river, what is the
18 contents in the stomach?

19 MR. HERSHBERGER: They don't eat
20 for, what, about a week or so before they
21 come in the river. Their stomachs are
22 pretty much empty by the time they're coming
23 in. There is a possibility, though, that
24 they are getting it from eating something
25 other than herring, possibly an invertebrae,
and this could also explain why we're seeing
the infection in herring, because obviously
herring aren't eating meat. Herring are
probably getting it either eating the spores
directly from the water or through an
invertebrae that may be carrying the
parasite. If it is an invertebrae, that's
another possible explanation as to how the
chinook are becoming infected.

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Could
they possibly be infected from the spores of
the dead fish in the Yukon River?

MR. HERSHBERGER: Yeah, yeah,
it's a distinct possibility. We'd like to
get some premigrant smults before they go
out to sea to see if they're infected too.

MR. NICHOLIA: Any more

1 questions?

Benedict?

2

3 MR. JONES: You say that a king
4 will eat anything, but our belief and old
5 custom that people tells us, anytime that
6 king salmon hits the Yukon River, you'll see
7 particles coming off the cotton trees, white
8 stuff, those are the salmon foods that
9 they've been telling us from way back. And
10 another question I'd like to ask if its the
11 condition of the non-salmon species, like
12 whitefish, 50 years ago. We used to get one
13 whitefish and you'd have about a half inch
14 of grease on top. Nowadays, you catch a
15 whitefish, especially this year, they're
16 really poor, the flesh is mushy, and no
17 grease.

10

11 DR. KOCAN: The amount of oil
12 that's present in -- in any animal is a
13 direct relation -- has a direct relationship
14 to what it's been eating. They found in
15 seabirds for instance, when they eat things
16 like herring, they have high fat contents in
17 their bodies and the young chicks that
18 they're feeding do much better than when
19 they switch over to a species of fish that
20 has a low-fat content. Then the birds lose
21 fat and the young chicks don't grow as well.
22 I suspect this is exactly the same thing
23 that's happening in fish. I don't know what
24 these fish are eating, but if they're losing
25 fat, it's possible that they've changed
their diet either because there's nothing
available, or because the species that
they're feeding on has changed in the river.
Sometimes foraging species change from one
to another. That's a possible explanation,
but we don't have any direct evidence for
this.

22 MR. JONES: Is there a
23 possibility of vegetation change in the
streams?

24 DR. KOCAN: Yes, could be.
25 Our study has been restricted
pretty much to looking at just the king
salmon as they return. We would like to

1 expand these studies ultimately. Once we
2 finish getting the information we need from
3 this, we'd like to expand this study to
4 include other freshwater species so that we
5 have a better idea of the entire ecosystem
6 and how all these species interact with one
7 another. We may be missing a very important
8 part here at this point because we aren't
9 looking at the other species. They all
10 interact with one another.

11 MR. HERSHBERGER: I did look at
12 chum salmon last year in Emmonak, and only
13 saw the parasite in 5 percent of the chum,
14 summer chum.

15 MR. SAM: What you're telling us
16 in essence, is that all studies to this
17 point is inconclusive?

18 MR. KOCAN: No, I wouldn't say
19 they're inconclusive. I would say that
20 studies that we've conducted so far show
21 that there's no question that the king
22 salmon are infected, that the king salmon
23 develop a pretty severe disease as they move
24 upstream that not only affects their
25 survival but also affects the quality of the
flesh that they have so that it loses value
commercially and it doesn't properly dry,
and I think it's affecting the number of
spawning females that are actually
reaching -- the number of females actually
capable of spawning. So, those are hard,
conclusive data that we've collected.

Where do they get the infection?
We have no idea at this point. That's
speculative. We would like to find out what
the interactions of other species in the
river are, that's inconclusive. But there
is no question that there is a severe
problem with this parasite with kings.

MR. SAM: Thank you, just a
little bit of house cleaning. It's after
4:00. There's no way, we have to go to the
evening session or go as long as we can.
The reason I'm asking for an evening session
is that I want all three Councils when we
get into our breakout sessions to spend as

1 much time as needed to handle each Council's
2 respective issues; so looking at the evening
3 session, just for your information, I don't
4 know whether you want to keep going or just
5 go call a special session at 7:00, because
6 we have a lot of Native organizations here
7 and we keep putting them on the back burner
8 all the time. I just don't want to do that.

9
10 MR. NICHOLIA: Anymore questions?
11 John Hanson?

12 MR. HANSON: Thank you,
13 Mr. Chairman. On the spawning chinook that
14 reach the -- will the roe that they spawn
15 also get the disease, that they drop their
16 roe and then the little fry, will those get
17 the same disease?

18 MR. HERSHBERGER: We have no
19 evidence, nor does anybody else, that the
20 parasite is what we call transferred from
21 the mother to the offspring. It probably is
22 not. The reason -- the reason for that is
23 because the parasite is so large.

24 However, we have been able to
25 isolate the parasite from ovaries. Not
necessarily from the eggs, but from the
ovaries of herring.

MR. KOCAN: I should mention that
if you haven't seen the annual report from
2000, that we did see 25 percent of the
females had abnormal eggs. Once we
examined, we looked at those to see if there
is any relationship between infection with
ichthyophonus and these abnormal eggs, and
we found no relationship between them.

However, if you look at the
pictures that we put into the annual report,
you'll see that there's no way that these
females could produce normal offspring
because the eggs are shriveled, they're
white, they're odd-shaped, there's something
else wrong with them. I think it's a
different phenomenon. There is a problem in
the river with chinook with egg production.
I don't believe it's related to this
disease.

1 MR. NICHOLIA: We'll go one more
2 question, then we have to listen to Frank
3 Charles, because he has to catch a plane
4 too.

5 MR. CHURCH: You know, I spoke
6 earlier of other species contracting the
7 disease by eating the decaying flesh and
8 eggs of salmon. Is there any possibility
9 that the salmon smelt that use the flesh for
10 their food source can contract the disease
11 and it would lie dormant until it goes into
12 salt water, returns back as a mature adult
13 to where it would become an active parasite?

14 DR. KOCAN: Yes, that's one of
15 the hypotheses we're working on, that these
16 fish actually do become infected before they
17 leave freshwater and carry it as you say in
18 a dormant state until they return. There
19 are a lot of things that change in the fish
20 when they return. Their hormones change,
21 immune system becomes stressed.

22 It is possible that that is how
23 they become infected.

24 We -- like I said, that's one of
25 the unknowns at this point, how they become
infected and one that is still open to
question. But that's a good possibility.

MR. CHURCH: So, it would be safe
to say that they could be contracting the
parasite during their smelt stage and
contracting it from the parents' stock?

MR. HERSHBERGER: It is possible.
Most researchers around the world
tend to agree, although this is not 100
percent, that we believe ichthyohonus
generally has a marine origin, that's found
mostly in marine fish. There's very few
examples of ichthyohonus becoming
established in freshwater situations which
makes the Yukon River unique in that we have
and anadromous fish coming back from the
river that bring it with them. Most of the
samples of ichthyohonus are of marine
origin.

MR. NICHOLIA: Thank you.

1 DR. KOCAN: You're welcome.

2 MR. NICHOLIA: Frank?
3 Go ahead. Vince?

4 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, we
5 may want to check to see if Wayne Morgan
6 also may have the same similar time
7 constraint. I believe he might.

8 MR. CHARLES: I'm not sure,
9 Vince.

10 MR. NICHOLIA: Is Wayne here to
11 see if that's the case? He mentioned during
12 a break that he was under a similar time
13 constraint. So, just so you know of that.

14 MR. CHARLES: Mr. Chairman, thank
15 you. I'll attempt to be very brief, as was
16 mentioned earlier or yesterday that I can
17 take up quite a bit of your time.
18 Fortunately for you I have a plane to catch,
19 so we'll keep this under four hours.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. CHARLES: As you heard from
22 the scientists that were just on, they first
23 learned of the disease from us. Our
24 involvement in the process is very
25 important. Our understanding in coming to
an awareness of how fisheries are managed,
assessed, and understood is very important.
As I indicated to you yesterday, our working
group on the Kuskokwim has been in existence
since 1988, established by Board of
Fisheries action to have further involvement
in managing our fishery, both commercially
and subsistence-wise. And to ensure that
escapement is also met.

For quite a few of those years,
we had no budget. In fact, Billy McCann can
tell you that he spent a lot of his own
money and time coming to Bethel from
Napakiak with his boat, motor, burning up a
lot of gas, as he likes to say, come and be
involved and represent his people and those
people that were concerned about managing

1 our fishery.

2 We're fortunate through the
3 involvement of Mr. Charlie Burkey, our area
4 biologist to have a proposal come through
5 for funding. It's a three-year project.
6 This year will mark our first year where we
7 have moneys to allow for a coordinator --
8 excuse me, an administrator, if you would,
9 that can take care of some of our
10 administrative functions that have been long
11 neglected such as minutes, notices and
12 whatnot.

13 The Department for up until this
14 last year has been pulling monies out of
15 somewhere to allow us to have
16 teleconferences and once in a great while to
17 meet in person.

18 We had a recent meeting where the
19 majority of our working group members,
20 including Mr. Collins, were there in person.
21 It was certainly a benefit for me to meet
22 him and see his face and to hear him in
23 person to help us decide as to where we're
24 going, so the funding is very important.

25 As I indicated, the funding at
present is geared specifically to support
the working group so we can meet, have
teleconferences, get our meetings -- meeting
minutes in order.

 But ideally, we should be looking
to something of the YRDFA model, where you
have coordinators.

 The reason I say that is that the
working group, since its inception, has
evolved into the kind of decision-making
body that decides on the very important
fishery, that is namely subsistence
fisheries.

 When we do that, we attempt to
have as much information as we can, as much
public involvement and input as we can, so
that as Mr. George pointed out to you
yesterday, we try to minimize the kinds of
occurrences where people are left short or
not having the opportunity to fish and to
feed themselves.

 We also are very concerned about
escapement. Make sure that the fish get
back up to the stream so they can spawn
regardless of whether they're diseased or

1 not. And just as importantly, as I
2 indicated, we attempt to understand how the
3 subsistence needs are being met all up and
4 down the river in season.

5 One thing that Wayne, I believe,
6 mentioned yesterday, is that we meet in
7 season during the summer, very frequently.

8 In fact, I feel like I have to
9 camp out at the U.S. Fish & Wildlife
10 Services offices. I'm so familiar with that
11 room right now, I feel like not coming in
12 there, like one time I didn't.

13 And that very clearly points out
14 to you how frequently we meet. And Ray can
15 tell you, Mr. Robert Nick and Billy and
16 James can tell you, sometimes it gets very
17 tedious. But what really helps is to have
18 good information, good support staff to make
19 sure that what we have to deal with, as
20 contentious and as difficult as they may be
21 at times, is such that we can feel
22 comfortable in making our decisions with.

23 And by the way, part of our
24 budget ideally would be to help support
25 people like Mr. Wayne Morgan from K & A to
allow for fisheries monitoring.

26 We have some monitoring programs
27 that are operated jointly with Fish &
28 Wildlife and ADF&G, which I believe Wayne
29 will get into in his presentation.

30 That is a very beneficial part of
31 our decision-making process. But, again,
32 making sure the people we represent are
33 aware of what's happening, what may be
34 happening and how we can prepare for it is
35 very important.

36 Thus far, it's been very
37 difficult to do so, because of limited
38 funding.

39 This last year, we finally had
40 funding to allow us to be able to inform the
41 public, let them know that you hear from
42 them as to how we can manage our fisheries
43 in a way that would insure that we have
44 adequate escapement and to insure that we
45 meet our subsistence needs.

46 And for me, it's a very
47 comforting thought to know that we finally
48 have some support moneys. It's not ideal,
49 it's not enough, but I hope that in coming

1 years that we'll have a bit more money to
2 allow for a support staff. And as you well
3 know with dual management of stands, it
4 becomes more critical and tantamount for us
5 to be able to communicate with one another
6 and have a good understanding of where
7 things are at and how we can best work
8 together.

9 Thus far, we've been lucky, as
10 I've indicated yesterday in coming here. I
11 anticipate from what my Elders have told me,
12 that we could look to the future resource
13 shortages and in that case, we need to be
14 able to have a good understanding between
15 those affected communities about how it is
16 that we can -- I hate to say this, allocate,
17 short of a Tier II situation, a limited
18 salmon resource.

19 And by the way, I have to note
20 that -- and I respectfully say that it's
21 been a real pleasure to work with the
22 working group, and just as important, it's
23 been a real pleasure working with
24 Mr. Charlie Burkey who is leaving our area
25 this December.

He has been there for about as
long as the working group, 13 years or so.
And Charlie, as many times as even I have
been at odds with him, has attempted to
objectively, concisely and professionally
state where things are at, and that makes a
big difference. And I'd like to extend a
note of appreciation to Charlie, and it's
been a real pleasure.

Thank you, Charlie.

And I -- I hope the successor can
come in with the same kind of objectiveness
that is necessary to understand our fishery.

That, Mr. Chairman, concludes my
presentation. Please bear in mind, I'm here
with an open hand begging for many. I'd
like to have the Partners and Fisheries
Program come to our area and especially to
our working group.

Thank you.

MR. NICHOLIA: Mary?

MS. GREGORY: I have yet to
see -- most of the disaster money that was

1 allocated for Yukon/Kuskokwim and other
2 places in Alaska reached the people that it
3 was intended for. A lot of times I hear
4 that the studies are made to the disaster
5 funds, and if that's been going on for a
6 while, and this would be a good project for
7 one of those disaster funds to fund, the
8 Bethel/Kuskokwim working group, because they
9 do -- they do a good job, and it's not --
10 the representatives are from the AVPC
11 region, the Fish & Wildlife, and the State
12 of Alaska. I often wonder what happened to
13 the disaster funds that were supposed to
14 help Native people.

15 MR. NICHOLIA: Before you go
16 there, I'd say that would it be possible for
17 them to write some kind of proposal, Vince,
18 from the Federal Subsistence Board, to
19 request funds to keep the working group
20 going?

21 MR. MATHEWS: Sure. They can
22 request of the Federal Subsistence Board, it
23 would be best to do that through the Fishery
24 Information Service, the stuff we've been
25 putting in proposals, which they have, which
26 they receive funding for, to submit another
27 one under that, the 02-69 process that we've
28 been going through. That would be fine, and
29 also they need to approach the different
30 managing agencies themselves, Fish &
31 Wildlife Service and Fish & Game for
32 funding, which I assume the working group
33 has in different ways to see what other
34 funding through Partnership Projects could
35 be tapped.

36 There may be others that can fill
37 this out.

38 I don't deal with funding that
39 much. So there may be other staff here that
40 can assist on that.

41 But, yes, they can, you can
42 request, but the Board generally does not
43 allocate money if that's the fair way of
44 saying it, except through this Fishery
45 Information Service Program.

46 MR. CHARLES: I'm not
47 specifically asking you to give me or to

1 give the working group moneys, but to ask
2 for your support knowing full well that you
understand just as I that our involvement in
keeping aware of things is very important.

3 By the way, prior to this last
4 year, you know, I wasn't really quite
certain as to or sure what it is the working
group actually did. You know, as long as I
5 was involved with it, you know, it really
had no authority, you know, the final
6 decision-making capacity resides with the
department of Fish & Game by regulation and
7 by statute.

8 We work with them, we give them
our recommendation, we fervently argue our
case, but ultimately, it's up to the
9 Department.

10 And then, too, before the last
few years, the working group really had no
involvement with subsistence fisheries. We
11 were primarily concerned with providing
commercial opportunity when -- it never
12 entered my mind, or entered Billy's or
James' minds about structures and that kind
13 of thing. So, we've evolved by necessity
into the kind of body that we are now.

14 We have a draft or -- excuse me,
we have a purpose, if you will, as defined
15 in our by-laws.

16 We have -- by State regulation, I
think it is two lines in the regulation
book, that define who we are.

17 And basically it's up to us and
by necessity with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife
18 Service and the Department we've evolved
into a -- Wayne, what do you think -- a
19 qualified decision-making body?

20 MR. NICHOLIA: Excuse me for
interrupting. You're asking for support --
21 from these three Councils to support your
working group, right?

22 MR. CHARLES: Thank you,
23 Mr. Chairman, Mr. Nicholia. I needed to
make it clear about the working group,
24 because the authority we have is just by
chance. We're the closest one there, if you
25 would. By the way, all the decision-making
resides with Wayne. So, ask him. He's the

1 one that knows.

2 But, really, it's only through
3 the involvement of our members, the 12
4 representative folk that we have. It's
5 their experience and knowledge and wisdom
6 that comes to bear and together without
7 funding, it's not going to happen very well
8 in the future. I think Rich Cannon will
9 speak more to that.

10 By the way, I know it's serious
11 when Rich is wearing his tie.

12 MR. CANNON: Everybody worries
13 when they see me come with a tie on.

14 Mr. Chairman, my comments were to
15 explain the process for requesting funding
16 through our program. We'll have a call for
17 proposals for the 2003 funding year that
18 will come out November 13th -- November
19 15th. And in addition, you've been
20 discussing, there's this Partnership in
21 Fisheries Program, and the call for
22 proposals for that process has been extended
23 and is currently open.

24 So, those are the two
25 opportunities that people have to make a
26 formal proposal for funding through our
27 process.

28 MR. NICHOLIA: I will do
29 something right now that will probably be
30 way out of line, but supporting this working
31 group, I was going to look around by
32 consensus, do we support these guys?

33 You got it.

34 MR. CHARLES: Thank you,
35 Mr. Chairman, and I believe Wayne will be
36 speaking to his projects, and Wayne, I'm
37 sorry, I didn't mean to steal any thunder
38 from you. Wayne is a co-chair with the
39 working group. He's done a wonderful job.
40 It's been a real privilege and honor to
41 learn from him, as it has been from my
42 Elders and other people that come through
43 that process. Without funding that's not
44 going to happen. I thank you for the time.
45 I'm going to go home and make sure my
46 soapbox is still there.

1 MR. NICHOLIA: Okay, just for the
2 record that we support the working group to
3 acquire funding through the Office of
Subsistence Management Program. That's what
you're looking for, Vince?

4 MR. MATHEWS: I am now.
5 Thank you.

6 MR. CHARLES: Thank you.

7 MR. NICHOLIA: Wayne?

8 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, my
9 name is Wayne Morgan. I'm the natural
resource director for the Kuskokwim Native
Association.

10 I know on the agenda it says
11 internship. I'll talk on the internship.
I'm going to try a little bit of history,
12 how we got started and how the internship
got started.

13 Turn off the light again. Can
you guys see okay?

14 Thank you.

15 The Kuskokwim Native Association
16 is a nonprofit organization whose mission is
to improve the social, the political, and
17 the economic well-being of our constituency.

18 One of our initiatives is to
safeguard the subsistence needs of the
Kuskokwim residents by being proactive in
19 management of salmon in the Kuskokwim Basin.

20 Our involvement in management has
three basic components. First, came in to
actively participate in local forums dealing
with salmon management. This includes
meeting with Kuskokwim River Salmon
21 Management working group, and the developing
Kuskokwim Fisheries Resource Coalition.

22 Another part of our involvement
is the development of projects that include
KNA in monitoring salmon escapement. KNA
has operated two weirs in partnership with
23 the Alaska Department of Fish & Game
commercial fisheries division. One on the
George River since 1996, and another on the
24 Tatlawiksuk River since '98.

25 The joint effort has strengthened
the effectiveness of both organizations and

1 fostered greater trust between the
2 organizations.

3 The third part of our involvement
4 is for KNA to develop avenues for promoting
5 local understanding and education on
6 fisheries issues.

7 Towards this end, KNA hires
8 people from within our region to work as
9 technicians at our weirs, our mark-recapture
10 tagging projects, our in-season subsistence
11 surveys, and -- plus we have a student
12 internship program by where local high
13 school students spend time at the weirs to
14 learn a little about projects, salmon
15 conservation, and salmon management.

16 Let me back up a minute.

17 KNA's interest in monitoring
18 salmon populations is rooted in the reliance
19 our people have on subsistence as a mainstay
20 of our lifestyle.

21 Streams within the KNA region
22 make up the bulk of the salmon spawning and
23 rearing habitat in the Kuskokwim river
24 Basin.

25 Some of the unknown number of
Kuskokwim River salmon are commercially
harvested in interception fisheries at sea.

The bulk of the commercial
harvest generally occurs in the Lower
Kuskokwim River.

People of the Middle Kuskokwim
River have felt the future of the Kuskokwim
River salmon is at risk because of the lack
of adequate monitoring of salmon
escapements.

In 1993, we experienced our first
official fishery disaster with the failed
run of chum salmon. We were outraged at
what we believed was to be mismanagement of
salmon escapement.

Our first response was to pursue
litigation. We even had a lawyer attend the
fishery management meetings we had in
Bethel, but then we decided our purpose
would be better served if we represented our
own interests.

So, we began attending and
participating in the management meetings.
We engaged in the debate, and we insured
that our voices were heard and factors into

1 the decision-making process.

2 Sometimes people wasted their
3 energy with arguing or political posturing
4 that is without the basic information needed
5 for making sound decisions.

6 This type of involvement results
7 in more of a competition in which one that
8 yells the -- yells the loudest or the
9 longest gets the attention.

10 However, wise salmon management
11 needs to be more than that.

12 Soon it became clear to us that a
13 challenge faced by the fishery managers;
14 there was a big information gap, but very
15 limited resources to try to fill that
16 information gap.

17 About that same time, research
18 funds were becoming available because of the
19 1993 fishery disaster.

20 KNA then began working with the
21 Alaska Department of Fish & Game staff to
22 secure some of that funding.

23 Then we began developing weirs
24 that were used to develop monitoring escape
25 on the George and the Tatlawiksuk River.
26 Soon other weir projects were initiated by a
27 variety of other groups.

28 For this past summer, now we have
29 a total of six monitoring projects including
30 the George and the Tatlawiksuk that are
31 still operated by KNA and the Alaska
32 Department of Fish & Game.

33 The management toolbox is still
34 less than perfect.

35 The numbers of returning salmon
36 have been very poor in recent years, but at
37 least the managers now have more of the
38 information they need to make better
39 management decisions and to better assess
40 the consequences of management actions. We
41 feel this is a big step in the right
42 direction.

43 Another of our goals is to get
44 more people in the villages involved and
45 familiar with salmon management.

46 In one year we hired 11
47 technicians locally to work at the projects.

48 Most of these technicians were
49 because of the student internship program
50 which we had since 1998.

1 Each intern is enrolled in the
2 program for one week or two if it's a
3 returning intern during which time they are
4 assigned to work at one of the two weirs we
5 operate with the Fish & Game.

6 KNA technicians and Fish & Game
7 technicians that work at the weirs mentor
8 the interns.

9 Next year we plan to include the
10 internship program into our mark-recapture
11 tags using fishwheels.

12 This helps -- the students help
13 with installing weirs, collecting samples,
14 collecting biological samples, doing camp
15 chores and whatever else needs to be done.

16 The technicians engage the
17 interns with discussions about the purpose
18 of the weir, salmon biology, and other
19 issues.

20 Currently, this more academic
21 part of the program is in the process of
22 developing into a more formal curriculum to
23 strengthen this part of the internship
24 program.

25 In addition to getting broader
26 public involvement, we are also trying to
27 develop a pool of future technicians and
28 perhaps even some future fishery biologists.

29 We have operated the internship
30 program for four seasons. There have been a
31 total of 40 participants, seven since have
32 graduated high school, three of the seven
33 have gone to college, and of the three in
34 the college, one is employed in the summer
35 as a Fish & Game technician and five are
36 employed as a KNA technician.

37 And the kids are enrolling or
38 applying in April, and we've been having at
39 least 20 to 30 applicants every year.

40 Given the short history of the
41 program, we view this as a success.

42 Future plans for KNA: Continue
43 involvement in local fisheries forums,
44 continued operation of our three weirs,
45 continued operation of the mark-recapture
46 projects and in-season subsistence survey
47 and continued operation of the student
48 internship program.

49 Plus we plan to expand into some
50 new areas.

1 We are hoping to have our own
fisheries biologist.

2 KNA has been quite successful at
3 effectively incorporating ourselves and the
people we serve into local salmon
management.

4 Our involvement in local
management forums coupled with the
5 information we help to gather is helping to
insure healthy salmon returns for the
6 future.

7 And our involvement ensures that
subsistence fishers on the Kuskokwim have
8 priority use of the fish that are available
for harvest.

9 Part of the value in developing
these partnerships is that they help to
10 build trust between State, Federal, and
Native organizations.

11 Before my time is up, I'd like to
take this opportunity to publicly thank
12 groups that have supported our efforts over
the years. I may miss some, but these
13 includes the Bering Sea Fishermen's
Association, the Bureau of Indian Affairs,
14 the National and Wildlife Foundation, the
National Marine Fisheries Service, Fish &
Wildlife Service, and the Office of
15 Subsistence Management.

16 And also the Alaska Department of
Fish & Game.

17 Thank you. This concludes my
presentation.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. NICHOLIA: Any questions for
Wayne?

20 Thank you.

21 MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

22 MR. NICHOLIA: As Ron told me, he
wanted the Chair back for a little while.
23 Let's give it back to him for a little
while, to finish up whatever before we left
24 off at.

25 Yes, just before we brought on
these three reports, we left out the
interregional proposals, and according to

1 Rich and Cliff, it was very short. Are you
2 prepared to continue?

3 MR. MATHEWS: I apologize for
4 walking over this earlier, to look at page
5 54 of the book on the table that shows the
6 two projects that deal with traditional
7 ecological knowledge on the inter-regional
8 process, and Cliff and Rich will tell you
9 which pages that Lester has asked for that
10 give you a summary of each of those
11 projects.

12 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
13 the table is on page 54, and the projects
14 are on pages 68 and 72.

15 MR. SAM: So, could you have
16 overheads or not?

17 MR. CANNON: No.

18 MR. SAM: Without much further
19 adieu, let's go into Project 02-043.

20 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
21 this is the Alaska Subsistence Fisheries
22 database, GIS integration, and this is a
23 project looking to integrate the existing
24 Alaska State subsistence fisheries database
25 with the GIS database to make this
information more readily available to user
groups. It was recommended for funding by
the TRC. I'll be glad to answer any
questions at this time.

MR. SAM: Questions for Cliff or
Richard from the Council?

Any public testimony or
questions?

I do have one, though.

Geographic information database,
how much is it different than the other one
that we spoke about. Rich?

MR. CANNON: Yes, Mr. Chairman,
Ron, this particular project as an
interregional project will develop a pilot
study that will use the geographic
information system as a format for -- for

1 training information, so it actually can
2 access the Internet, people in remote areas
3 if they have remote access can get into the
4 database. That's a special type of
5 application that's being designed to get
6 information out to projects or to people in
7 groups all over the state.

8 The other project deals
9 specifically with AYK data, which is any of
10 the other areas of the state is the least
11 developed. The AYK needed a little extra
12 help.

13 MR. SAM: Any further questions
14 for Rich or Cliff?
15 Any public testimony?
16 If not, let's go into the 02-047.

17 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Mr. Chairman,
18 this is the "Alaska Subsistence Salmon
19 Harvest Timing (Phase 1): Bristol Bay,
20 Chignik District, Cook Inlet, and Kuskokwim
21 Drainage." This project was looking at
22 developing a database for harvest timing
23 data which is -- in representing that data
24 in a graphical display so basically the
25 timing -- not the run timing, the harvest
26 timing, when people traditional collected
27 their subsistence fishing information, or
28 fishing -- collected their subsistence fish.
29 The timing of that as it progressed up the
30 drainages.

31 So, the goal of this project was
32 to collect this information into a database
33 and display it graphically so you'd have a
34 graph that showed the months and species of
35 fish and the timing of the harvest of those
36 fish, and this was also going to help
37 improve reporting for subsistence harvests
38 by showing that the reporting could be used
39 as a management tool.

40 This project was not recommended
41 for funding by the TRC. It was due to
42 limited funding available.

43 MR. SAM: Any questions for Rich
44 or Cliff?
45 Any public testimony?
46 Questions?
47 If not, the Chair will entertain

1 a motion to accept the proposal on 02-047.

2 MR. NICHOLIA: So moved.

3 MR. SAM: Moved by Gerald.

4 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

5 MR. SAM: Seconded by Jack
6 Reakoff.

7 Any further discussion?

8 If not, all those in favor of the
9 motion, signify by saying "aye."

10 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

11 MR. SAM: Opposed, same sign.

12 While we still have you on the
13 table, it was brought to our attention
14 earlier that we were going to question the
15 investigators on all of our proposals from
16 here on in. So, it would be to the
17 Council's -- Council's benefit that the
18 investigators involved should be listed with
19 all projects. There was an oversight on
20 the -- by us on the proposals to do some
21 research on that sport fishing mortality
22 rate, right?

23 MR. SAM: Catch-and-release.

24 Catch-and-release program.
25 According to some people that we met during
the break, they stated to us that the
proponents of this proposal was by Alaska
Sports Fisheries Association, commercial,
and they were the ones that were going to do
the investigation.

So, between a few of us, we would
like to at this time -- at this time the
Chair would entertain a motion that all
further investigators or investigations on
these proposals be done by an independent
firm, independent of the subsistence users
and/or sports fisheries users. So the Chair
would entertain a motion to that effect and
we will probably address the issue again in
resolutions form when we meet within our own
Councils. If this is comfortable with the
Council members.

Lester?

1

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.:

2

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to correct your statement. The investigators for the catch-and-release program were Fish & Wildlife Sports Division. And I felt that -- or we felt that the -- if that proposal is to be funded, that it be -- the study be done by somebody outside of the sport division and that independent investigator be -- or independent company be hired, that we make recommendations to the subsistence Board that independent investigators outside of the fish division be hired to do the investigation on that catch-and-release proposal.

9

MR. SAM: Thank you, Lester for that clarification. Is that a formal motion?

11

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if there was not a prior motion, I would like to make that motion.

13

MR. SAM: Thank you, Lester. Is there a second?

14

MR. NICHOLIA: Second.

15

MR. SAM: Any further discussion? Okay. Vince?

16

17

MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as one of the coordinators, and yours particularly, I caution you with motions like this. I know what you're driving at, but there are safeguards within the parameters that set up these agencies that they have by statute, meaning law, by regulations, to be thorough managers and to be, you know, up and up on that and also professionally, that they're professional staff that are bound by professional goals also.

23

Why I'm cautioning you on this -- if your action was to go fully approved, your pool of people to actually conduct these type of projects will be greatly reduced. Maybe others can speak on that,

24

25

1 but that's how I'm assessing if your action
was taken and followed.

2 So, with that, I'll stop and take
3 questions on what I'm driving at.

4 MR. SAM: Rich, I'm going to
direct this question to you.

5 How would this motion be
detrimental to our operations?

6 MR. CANNON: I -- you know, I
want to preface my comments because I think,
7 officially, your Council members are very
experienced, certainly capable of, you know,
8 making your minds up about things like this,
and I'm not in any way trying to lobby you
9 one way or the other. I just wanted to make
one point as you consider this. And that
10 is, is that if you're saying what you're
saying, at least that what I understand, is
11 that you have a concern about the sport
fisheries division Fish & Game being
12 involved with this work.

13 One thing that occurs to me --
and I was involved with setting up YRDFA,
and I was involved with setting up the
14 working group. And I work for the
Department, and I sat out the other side,
15 and I saw people not trusting each other,
and in many cases total communication
16 breakdown, and putting fisheries at risk
because people couldn't work together.

17 Because of people like John White
in both regions, there are so many people
18 that saw this problem. Local people said we
need to do something different and we began
19 taking small steps to work together. And
over time, you know, it's not perfect, but
20 we're learning to trust each other, and I
think the last presentation, Wayne's
21 presentation -- as I looked at that, I was
so happy because so many of our goals are
22 being not just people locally, but I think
people in the Departments see this as a goal
23 too, are being realized.

24 And I think that's possible to
see this happen with other groups as well.
The sport fisheries division isn't going to
25 go away, and they have a job to do, and I
personally think they do a good job with

1 many of the things they do. Some of the
2 scientists are the best in the State, they
3 really are. I've worked with them.

4 And I would encourage you to try
5 to work through this with this important
6 division of the Department of Fish & Game,
7 because I think you can over time, through
8 working together on these issues, I think
9 you can arrive at a much better working
10 relationship and much better understanding.
11 So, don't discount them because of who they
12 worked with in the past. That would be my
13 plea.

14 MR. SAM: Thank you, Rich.
15 Lester?

16 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: It
17 sounded like I mistrust the division, it
18 wasn't because of that. It was because of
19 looking at the other side where if in the
20 event that the study comes out where it
21 affects the -- I don't know what the word
22 is, but I find it be more unbiased if a
23 different -- somebody else from outside the
24 community did this study. It would --
25 because it could affect the division one way
or the other on -- depending on how the
outcome of the study was. And if the study
was -- came out substantiating the claim of
the sports fishermen who claim that their
method of catch-and-release is the least or
the best way to handle fish, then, you know,
it will come out from a unbiased person.
That was the only reason that -- that was
one of the reasons I suggested that.

MR. SAM: Cliff, did you have
anything to add?

MR. SCHLEUSNER: No,
Mr. Chairman.

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: In the
issue, it says contemporary sports average
letters consider catch-and-release, a
legitimate, design fishing practice. We in
the subsistence arena don't think that's
their place.

1 MR. SAM: Sorry for that
oversight, Lester.

2 Any further -- okay. Ida come
3 back up to the microphone, please. We
recognize Ida Hildebrand.

4 MS. HILDEBRAND: Thank you,
5 Mr. Chairman, Ida Hildebrand, BIA staff
6 member. I just want to caution the Councils
7 as the staff does, as I agree with you that
8 you have every right to demand names from
9 the office of subsistence management who did
10 the study for you, to know who the
11 investigators and how they're going to
12 proceed in doing those studies, that kind of
13 information is in your text. Unfortunately
14 it didn't get to you in sufficient time for
15 all of you to review them. The part I would
16 really caution you against is to tell
17 Fisheries Information Services you cannot
deal with the sports fish division of ADF&G.
You can ask them for various precautions to
ensure that the study is unbiased by the
involvement of other entities such as the
Partners or the cooperators when they do a
project, they try to get the local group --
the local Tribe, local organizations
involved, but I would really caution against
an explicit motion that would eliminate or
tell fishermen -- Fisheries Information
Services not to proceed with studies with
specific scientists. It's just a caution.
It's a very strong caution.

18 MR. SAM: Thank you, Ida.
19 Jack, again.

20 MR. REAKOFF: I also feel that --
21 the same way Ida does, that what the effect
22 of this motion will do will kill this
23 project, and what we need is this project to
24 document mortalities of catch-and-release
25 fish. What we can demand is that the Office
of Subsistence Management and the
division -- the sport -- the subsistence
division of the State oversee the sport fish
division to assure that the stat is as clean
as possible. That would be the checks and
balances of a project like this.

But to eliminate the sport fish

1 division, would -- may go against these
2 agreements that also we've made with the
3 State.

3 MR. SAM: Cliff?

4 MR. SCHLEUSNER: Yes, I would
5 agree with what Jack Reakoff said and Ida
6 and Vince and Rich, that in the spirit of
7 cooperation and collaboration that isolating
8 individuals or agencies or specific branches
9 of agencies is -- would not be productive in
10 getting the work done, the research done,
11 and I think the integrity of the individuals
12 are calling into the integrity of the
13 individuals or the organizations is
14 counterproductive.

10 MR. SAM: Any further questions?
11 If not, we do have a motion on
12 the floor, what's the pleasure of the
13 Councils?

12 Do you want to go forward with
13 this or do you want to withdraw it or re --
14 for reconsiderations?

14 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Do I have
15 a second to that motion?

15 MR. SAM: Yes, right here.

16 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Let's go
17 with the motion, see how it turns out.

18 MR. SAM: Okay. Without
19 amendment?

19 The Chair will --

20 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Roll
21 call.

21 MR. SAM: Make our motion,
22 request a roll call, Vince.

23 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
24 Yukon/Kuskokwim Delta Regional Council,
25 Harry Wilde?

25 MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Yeah.

1 MR. MATHEWS: John Hanson?
2 MR. HANSON: Yeah.
3 MR. MATHEWS: Mary Gregory?
4 MS. GREGORY: Yes.
5 MR. MATHEWS: Fritz George -- I'm
6 sorry. Willard Church?
7 MR. CHURCH: Abstain.
8 MR. MATHEWS: Billy McCann?
9 MR. McCANN: Yes.
10 MR. MATHEWS: James Charles?
11 MR. CHARLES: Yes.
12 MR. MATHEWS: Phillip Moses?
13 MR. MOSES: Yeah.
14 MR. MATHEWS: Lester Wilde?
15 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Yes.
16 MR. MATHEWS: Alvin Owletuck?
17 MR. OWLETUCK: Yes.
18 MR. MATHEWS: Majority voted in
19 support of the motion. Western Interior. Carl Morgan?
20 MR. MORGAN: (No response.)
21 MR. MATHEWS: Benedict Jones.
22 MR. JONES: Yes.
23 MR. MATHEWS: Angela Demientieff?
24 MS. DEMIENTIEFF: Yes.
25 MR. MATHEWS: Sampson Henry?

1 MR. HENRY: Yes.

2 MR. MATHEWS: Jack Reakoff?

3 MR. REAKOFF: No.

4 MR. MATHEWS: Ray Collins?

5 MR. COLLINS: No.

6 MR. MATHEWS: Ron Sam?

7 MR. SAM: Abstain. I feel both
8 sides.

9 MR. MATHEWS: I haven't run a
10 tally to see what -- others have run a
11 tally?

12 MS. HILDEBRAND: Three yeses; two
13 nos; two abstains.

14 MR. MATHEWS: So it goes forward,
15 the motion.
16 Eastern Interior, Gerald
17 Nicholia?

18 MR. NICHOLIA: (No response.)

19 MR. MATHEWS: David James?

20 MR. JAMES: Yes.

21 MR. MATHEWS: Jim Wilde?

22 MR. JIM WILDE: Yes.

23 MR. MATHEWS: For clarification,
24 if I understood, the no response was
25 abstaining from the members that did not
voice?

26 MR. SAM: Let's go with the count
27 right now. I think it's quite apparent
28 where we stand.

29 MR. MATHEWS: Well then that
30 would be two for and one abstaining. On
31 Eastern Interior, it appears the motion
32 passes by all three Councils.

1

MR. SAM: Okay. Thank you.

2

It is now 5:15. What else do we have on the agenda? Got a whole bunch.

3

4

MR. McCANN: Well, we obviously have the remaining process to deal with the summaries of the 2000-2001 -- we have the Kuskokwim to go through on all the fishery information projects passed, and then for 2002. We also have Native corporations to present, if they would like, to the Council, testify about their concerns or items that they would like to share, and then we do need to cover customary trade today, because of the fact the key presenter of it goes tomorrow to the Board of Fisheries for duties there. So he needs to present today. So those are the remaining things that are before you. Unless I left some out, hopefully staff will correct me if I've left anything out.

10

11

12

What's the pleasure of the Council? Do you want to break for lunch right now and come back or just keep going for the time being?

14

15

MR. JAMES: Can we have customary trade and break until tomorrow?

16

17

18

19

MR. SAM: One of the reasons I wanted an evening session was that so when we do break out to our separate Council deliberations that we have enough time to cover everything within each separate Council. But it's up to the Board -- it's up to the Council whether you want to keep going or break.

20

21

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Mr. Chairman, would it be possible to keep going for a couple hours to see how far we get and at that time decide to break?

22

23

MR. SAM: Can I see a show of hands of all those in favor of that, a show of hands, just keep going for now?

24

25

Okay. It looks like we keep going for now, unless I hear an objection. So, the next item on the agenda,

1 then, would be the Kuskokwim.

2 MR. MATHEWS: Yes, Mr. Chairman,
3 and that material is under D-1. And we
4 just -- we just need a few minutes to set up
5 some gear here, so with indulgence, if we
6 could have a five-minute chance to set up it
7 would be great.

8 MR. SAM: Yeah. Before -- while
9 we're changing out, Gerald Nicholia would be
10 running -- will be chairing the next
11 session.

12 MR. NICHOLIA: Call the meeting
13 back to order.

14 If it's all right with the three
15 Councils, instead of going, we're going to
16 take Pete Probasco out of order because he's
17 going to be testifying tomorrow before the
18 Board of Fish.

19 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, the
20 materials under the customary trade is under
21 Tab F, to give you a little bit. I know
22 Pete will probably be the same. You had a
23 member from each of the Councils served on
24 the Task Force, so, for your Councils, Ray
25 Collins for Western, for Eastern Interior
26 was Chuck Miller, Sr., and for
27 Yukon/Kuskokwim I believe was Robert Nick.

28 So, obviously, two of them aren't
29 here, but I'd encourage Ray to share during
30 this discussion how -- he was there with the
31 development of this, so that should -- you
32 should hear from him and other
33 representatives.

34 MR. PROBASCO: Lester?

35 MR. MATHEWS: And Lester, I'm
36 sorry. I didn't attend most of the
37 meetings, and Lester Wilde was part of the
38 process. Please other Councils realize that
39 they were involved in the development of
40 this.

41 Thank you.

42 MR. PROBASCO: Thank you. To
43 the chairmen, I thank you for taking us out

1 of sequence. I think all of us agree that
2 the issue of customary trade and defining it
3 is a very important issue for all the
4 Regional Councils throughout the State. The
5 purpose of my presentation on this is to
6 provide you with the draft regulatory
7 language that's before the Councils for
8 their review and input and hopefully answer
9 any questions that you may have.

10 As Vince pointed out, the
11 complete draft language is in your booklet,
12 and please reference that as I go through my
13 presentation.

14 My presentation will cover four
15 areas: History of why the issue of
16 customary trade is before you, discussion of
17 the proposed regulatory language, schedule
18 of events for the timeline as we work toward
19 a final rule, and the importance of your
20 Regional Council input.

21 It's important that we first
22 establish what is meant in regulatory terms
23 when we discuss customary trade.

24 Customary trade in the Federal
25 arena pertains only to cash sales, money of
subistence harvested fish.

1 In regulation the act of
2 bartering is treated separate, is not
3 included with the term of customary trade.
4 So, please do not intertwine these or group
5 them. Customary trade when we talk in
6 regulatory terms, even though in day-to-day
7 terms we treat them all the same, customary
8 trade as we define the regulation talks
9 about cash sales only.

10 It's also very important that I
11 emphasize that this draft regulatory
12 language deals with only the cash sale of
13 fish, not wildlife species. Only the cash
14 sale of fish.

15 Current Federal subsistence
16 management regulations specifically address
17 customary trade and barter. However, the
18 regulatory language pertaining to customary
19 trade is not specific enough to define
20 allowable levels. An important factor of
21 current Federal regulations in defining
22 customary trade is that the regulations
23 clearly recognize and allows for the cash
24 sales. That is in regulation, cash sales

1 are addressed.

2 However, when they discuss cash
3 sales, they also state that subsistence-
4 harvested fish can be sold as long as a cash
5 transaction does not constitute a
6 significant commercial enterprise.

7 Unfortunately, the drafters of
8 this language did not define the parameters
9 of what constitutes a significant commercial
10 enterprise. At times this has resulted in
11 uncertainty pertaining to what is
12 permissible when a subsistence-harvested
13 fish is exchanged for cash. Further, the
14 current regulation, as written, is
15 unenforceable.

16 Retention of the current
17 regulatory language would or could invite
18 abuse from those who wish to use
19 subsistence-harvested fish for monetary gain
20 to the detriments of subsistence users and
21 uses. If the limits of cash exchange are
22 not defined, then by allowing the exchange
23 to go unchecked could potentially result in
24 a negative impact on other subsistence uses
25 and users. This is why the Federal
Subsistence Board established the customary
trade Task Force, to develop this draft
regulatory language before you which clearly
defines customary trade as a subsistence use
and specifies appropriate limitations.

26 A great deal of planning and
27 thought went into the formation of this Task
28 Force to make sure that the group formed had
29 the expertise and background to tackle the
30 assignment. This is one of the primary
31 reasons why the Regional Council members
32 were needed on this Task Force. We as the
33 Council members -- one member from each
34 Council, for a total of ten members on this
35 Task Force. And Vince acknowledged the
36 gentlemen that's worked with us on this Task
37 Force that come from these three Councils.

38 The goal of the Task Force is to
39 develop draft regulatory language that
40 provides for the long-established practices
41 of customary trade, is consistent with the
42 definition of subsistence uses in section
43 803 of ANILCA and defines the limits to
44 these cash sales. The customary trade Task
45 Force has met on three different occasions,

1 the last meeting being August 1st and 2nd
2 when the draft regulatory language was
3 finalized. This draft language is now
4 before the Councils for their review and
5 comment during the fall meetings.

6 The underlying themes of the
7 proposed language was to develop language
8 that is fair, prevents abuses, meets the
9 needs of Federally qualified subsistence
10 users, and does not prevent or limit the
11 trade or sale between communities or
12 villages.

13 In working toward the final rule,
14 there are numerous step that also must be
15 followed. I would like to briefly go over
16 these with you and I'll make it very brief,
17 these are laid out in your Tab.

18 The first step which we are
19 currently in, is a very important step in
20 that it provides the first opportunity for
21 the Regional Councils, Tribal governments,
22 and public to directly comment on the draft
23 regulatory language. Council comments are
24 being solicited at all Council meetings. By
25 the 1st of December, all comments will be
summarized and delivered to the Task Force.
The Task Force will review the comments and
recommend to the staff committee and Federal
Subsistence Board how to address Council's
concerns.

It is important to note that this
is not your only opportunity to comment on
this document. You as a Council will be
involved throughout the entire process.
Final comments or recommendations to the
Board will be due just prior to the Federal
Subsistence Board May 2002, or this coming
spring's meeting.

Between November 1st and the
15th, the Task Force will meet which will --
the meeting has been scheduled for the 2nd
of November and will consider the comments
from the Regional Councils, Tribal
governments, and public and recommend from
the Task Force perspective on how to address
these comments.

Prior to the Federal subsistence
December, 2002 meeting, the interagency
staff committee will review old comments
received to date and will develop

1 recommendations on the draft preamble and
2 proposed regulatory language.

3 At the Federal subsistence
4 December meeting, the Federal Subsistence
5 Board will take action in developing the
6 proposed rule.

7 This proposed rule will be
8 published in the Federal Register.

9 At that point, Regional Councils,
10 Tribal governments, and the public will
11 again be asked to review and comment on the
12 proposed rule.

13 Regional Councils will be asked
14 for their recommendations during our winter
15 meetings in February and March, and these
16 comments should be delivered to the Federal
17 Subsistence Board just prior to the May,
18 2002 meeting.

19 Then the interagency staff
20 committee will review comments pertaining to
21 the proposed rule and develop their
22 recommendations.

23 During the May 2002 Federal
24 Subsistence Board meeting, the Board will
25 review all comments and recommendations from
the Regional Councils, Tribal governments,
public, and staff committee. And final
action will take place that May meeting.

Then the publication of the final
rule will occur in May and the goal is to
have a final rule by July of 2002.

To the Chairs at this time, I'd
like to introduce Mr. Carl Jack, the Native
liaison for the Federal Subsistence Board,
and he will update you on the Tribal
consultation process addressing customary
trade.

Carl?

MR. JACK: Guyana, Mr. Chairman,
members of the Council, as Pete said in
my -- my comments will be limited to what we
call Tribal consultation. Tribal
consultation is something that is new to the
program. It has not been practiced much
before, so it's kind of plowing new grounds.

It's something that is not
practiced on the State programs, but for
this Federal program it will be done so.

On Tribal consultation -- as you

1 recall last year, during the joint Eastern-
2 Western Interior meeting and the meeting in
3 Kotlik, I made presentations on the document
4 that was signed in this area between the
5 four Federal agencies, and that was done on
6 January 19th, 2001, way before Federal
agencies, along with the Alaska Special
Assistant to the Secretary, Marilyn Hyman,
signed an Alaska policy on government to
government relations with the Alaska Native
tribes.

It is that policy that now guides
the Office of Subsistence Management on
Tribal consultation.

8 The customary trade proposed
9 regulations will impact all of the Alaska
10 Natives, Tribes and Tribal members, and it
is for that very reason that OSM has
initiated Tribal consultation specific to
this.

11 And that was started on about
12 August of 2001. Where the proposed
regulatory language that's in your book was
mailed to each and every one of the 229
13 Federally recognized Tribes in Alaska,
comment period in the transmittal --
14 transmittal letter was specified as being
from September to October 31, 2001.

15 But that comment, the end of the
comment period will not information close
16 the public nor the Tribal governments the
opportunity to meet -- make comments, and
17 that is the tribes can submit their
testimony directly to the Federal
18 Subsistence Board in their December meeting
in preparation for Tribal consultation --
19 and this was at the time when the customary
trade Task Force really got serious last
20 spring, and started addressing the proposed
regulatory language. We met a number of us,
21 from OSM, met with the officials of the
Alaska interTribal Council, and informed
22 them the intent of the Federal agencies to
initiate Tribal consultation.

23 In consultation with AIPC, a
two-phase Tribal consultation process was
24 conceived. The first one, of course, to
mail the proposed regulatory language to all
25 the Tribes in Alaska; and secondly, if the
Tribes have questions, then we indicated in

1 the transmittal letter that we would make
2 every effort to meet with them one on one
3 for further -- to further discuss the
4 proposed regulatory language.

5 The reasons why Tribes have a
6 unique legal relationship with the United
7 States Government. And the comments and the
8 concerns from the Tribes can be made
9 directly to the Federal Subsistence Board.

10 In addition, as Pete mentioned
11 earlier, OSM and the other Federal agencies
12 are bound by what they call the
13 Administrative Procedures Act. A proposed
14 rule, and that is the proposed rule will be
15 published in the Federal Register and the
16 public and the Tribal governments will then
17 have that opportunity to provide additional
18 comments before the final rule is adopted by
19 the Federal Subsistence Board.

20 So, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman,
21 the Office of Subsistence Management is
22 committed to consultation with Alaska
23 Federally Recognized Tribes in accordance
24 with the executive orders and policies that
25 guide the service.

Consultation on the customary
trade issue and the draft regulatory
language that was developed by the Task
Force will occur and is occurring right now,
and the final rule will not be adopted until
review and consultation opportunities have
been provided to the Tribal governments in
Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my
part.

MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chairs, I'd
like to focus now on the regulatory language
that's in your booklet and let me go over
the three parts that are in there to give
more clarification.

Part 16 of the regulation, the
first part of this proposed regulatory
language deals with the cash sales of
subsistence- harvested fish between rural
residents or Federally qualified subsistence
users. In summary, the Task Force is
recommending that no limits on cash sales
between rural residents be established.
That's the first part.

1 The second part of the
2 regulations deals with rural residents, the
3 sale of subsistence-harvested fish to
4 others. And in this section, you will see
5 the first recommendation as a proposed cap
6 for the sale of salmon. And that only deals
7 with salmon, none of the other fish species,
8 and the Federal or the Task Force at this
9 point is recommending that a cap of \$1,000
10 per individual when the sales of
11 subsistence-harvested fish occurs between a
12 rural resident and other nonrural residents.

13 And the final section prohibits
14 the sale of subsistence-harvested fish to
15 fish processing businesses -- in other
16 words, businesses that are licensed under
17 the State of Alaska to conduct and supply
18 commercial-sale fish.

19 Mr. Chairman, both Mr. Jack and I
20 are available for questions if you desire.
21 Vince asked me to point out that tomorrow
22 each of the respective Councils will be
23 provided the opportunity to go in detail on
24 the customary trade. But if there's
25 specific questions that either of us at this
time could answer, we would be glad to do
so.

 Mr. Chairs?

15 MR. NICHOLIA: Yeah, Pete, me,
16 Craig Fleener and Chuck Miller, before Chuck
17 resigned, we talked about this one specific
18 dealer, especially with the Eastern
19 Interior, how's it going to work out between
20 the river system and the road system, they
21 don't catch salmon up around Fairbanks area.
22 It's regarding kind of -- we never came to a
23 conclusion because -- because from the road
24 system it's very way different to the river
25 system. Because the river system people
need that cash income. But the road system,
they got access, like to supermarket and
stuff and lower gas prices. What me and
Craig was talking about, how is this going
to come into play with our region, because
we got a road and a river system to deal
with?

25 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, Gerald,
as the regulation is currently written --

1 let me answer it in two parts. As the
2 regulation is currently written both
3 Federally qualified subsistence users living
4 on the road system would be treated to the
5 identical as those living off the road
6 system. With that said, what we have found
7 as we've gone through the Councils prior to
8 this meeting, some Councils have elected to
9 agree to the language as drafted, and others
10 have written specific language addressing
11 the amount of cash sales to other nonrural
12 residents, and that's definitely in -- the
13 prerogative as a recommendation from the
14 respective Councils to do that. That's why
15 we're here asking for that input to get, if
16 so desired, specific Regional Council
17 comments on regulatory language drafted for
18 their area.

19 Mr. Chair?

20 MR. NICHOLIA: Any questions for
21 these guys? I'm sure you guys got some.
22 Phillip?

23 MR. MOSES: The one that just
24 said, I just now heard what it said. Long
25 ago when I was young, before money was
available, we used to use kayaks, we used to
travel only by kayak. It's always been like
that where we could trade with the other
Yupik people that's always been around.
It's been around since I was little. And we
Yupik people don't have the same food even
though we're all Yupik, we don't have the
same food. And so we would trade with the
other people what they have, we'd like what
they have so we trade. So we trade what
they wouldn't have. That's how it has been
since way back when. And they still to this
day do that. Because our foods are not the
same and the people that live in the ocean
have different foods and upriver they also
have different foods from -- and because of
that, we trade, because they -- the people
that live upriver need seal oil because they
like seal oil and the people that live in
the ocean would like what they have, their
foods, because their land doesn't have what
they have upriver and that's how they would
trade, because they didn't have money, so

1 they would use different foods to trade for
2 their food.

3 And now because money is
4 available now some people buy what they have
5 upriver that -- that the people upriver need
6 seal oil, so they buy what they have with
7 money.

8 What he's talking about seems
9 like a lot of money. It's not a lot of
10 money that they trade with. They don't
11 spend a lot of money buying food. And what
12 they trade still goes on today and it's been
13 around. And now the people that have money
14 use money and the people that live by the
15 ocean also use food to buy from the people
16 that live upriver.

17 But still, and they also give, if
18 the people don't have money. They also
19 share what they have to not think about
20 money.

21 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: He doesn't
22 like what he's saying.

23 MR. MOSES: And if the other
24 people want to fish, if the fishing didn't
25 want to fish, they sell -- they sell the
26 fish even though they're still in the water,
27 it's like you're selling -- even though the
28 fish are still swimming. If you're going to
29 be sport fishing. And what you're buying is
30 not even on land yet. It's like that.

31 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: He's
32 uncomfortable with that.

33 MR. MOSES: You're not supposed
34 to sell fish that you haven't even caught.
35 And this -- what you trade is what you don't
36 like and you're speaking about it like it's
37 a lot of money and up to \$1,000 it's way
38 less than \$1,000 that they use. And it's
39 not like what you're saying. It's not a lot
40 of money.

41 I haven't seen that where people
42 pay up to \$1,000.

43 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: He has not
44 seen that.

1 MR. MOSES: And people don't
2 think about themselves.

3 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: He used to
4 fish in Bristol Bay.

5 MR. MOSES: You have to watch
6 that, if you go out of the boat or you find
7 them a lot of money and you take what little
8 fish they caught.

9 And they go out of bounds by
10 accident, they really watch them and they
11 take the money that they have and what they
12 worked for, but the customary trade, you
13 don't like that.

14 They should be happy. The people
15 are happy when they live down by the ocean
16 and upriver. They're glad to have the
17 customary trade. And that's been going on
18 from way back when.

19 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: And he
20 doesn't like that.

21 MR. MOSES: And now there's money
22 available, so they pay what they want and
23 it's not a lot of money. They don't pay a
24 lot of money to buy the food they want.

25 Then now there are people from
like around Nunachuak.

 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: He's from the
coast.

 MR. MOSES: And it's true what
I'm saying that what I've seen and heard
before.

 Thank you.

 MS. GREGORY: (Through the
interpreter.) Mr. Chairman -- she's telling
him that he might have misunderstood that
the salmon if you -- if you sell salmon you
cannot -- it cannot pass over \$1,000. When
the fish -- you have to use the license to
fish and what the people up here on the
committee are talking about that's what
they're explaining. That the people -- the
\$1,000, you cannot exceed \$1,000 within a
year.

1 I have a question for either Pete
2 or Carl.

3 I know some people trade cash for
4 berries, so will that apply or it's just for
5 salmon?

6 MR. JACK: This proposed
7 regulation is just for salmon. It does not
8 affect any other subsistence resources.

9 Mr. Chairman, while I have the
10 floor, I would just like to clarify to
11 Mr. Moses.

12 MR. JACK: (Through the
13 interpreter.) This is not going to affect
14 this. This is not going to affect the
15 customary trade that's going to go on. And
16 what they say is true that sometimes, you
17 know, that they trade food whether other
18 people. That's what we're talking about
19 where the thousand is a limit to each family
20 member.

21 (In English.) What I mentioned
22 to Mr. Moses, that the traditional practice
23 of barter will not be affected by the
24 proposed regulation. It's just the
25 customary trade sale of fish will be the
only proposed regulation.

MR. MOSES: But even though
that's what we're talking about as food is
the salmon. We sell salmon, but we don't
give them a lot. And they want to buy the
salmon so in case they don't have food, they
want to buy the salmon and to the people
that sell it all the time, but even though
they -- if they've got children to feed, it
would -- it would really not matter to him.
If the person can sell the fish, it will be
okay with him.

TRANSLATOR BRYANT: He's
comfortable with that to the Yupik people.

MR. McCANN: (Through the
interpreter.) He is going to ask him in
Yupik that he thinks that Phillip
misunderstood the customary trade to trade
with money. But he thinks about it today.
Sometimes the White people do what they want

1 to do, not listen to us.

2 TRANSLATOR BRYANT: He's talking
3 about the other food, or the other like
4 commercial fishing where you have to have a
5 license.

6 MR. McCANN: (In English) I'm
7 wondering the license system, just bay
8 trading the fish to the money, I'm only
9 thinking about they might go into that some
10 day.

11 MR. McCANN: (Through the
12 interpreter.) It's going to be the law.
13 It's not supposed to exceed the \$1,000, not
14 to exceed \$1,000 except on he's worried what
15 it's going to do if you have to have a
16 license.

17 MR. JACK: Billy, there's three
18 parts to also the regulatory language. The
19 first part is qualified subsistence users in
20 rural areas to another, that's customary
21 trade between rural to rural. No limit.

22 MR. JACK: (Through the
23 interpreter.) Then the thousand is to the
24 others. Users to others, like at AFN, to
25 others.

26 Third part, fish buyers
27 prohibited, fish buyers to people -- they're
28 not allowed to sell subsistence-caught fish.

29 Three parts to the proposed
30 language. Rural to rural, no limit.

31 Rural to others, limit is \$1,000
32 per family member, salmon only, and the
33 third part is basically a prohibition
34 prohibiting the licensed fish processors
35 from buying subsistence-caught fish.

36 So, that's what -- yeah.

37 MR. McCANN: What about what you
38 just said about qualified?

39 Subsistence person has to be
40 qualified, subsistence man, something like
41 that.

42 MR. JACK: Under the current
43 statute, ANILCA -- under ANILCA the

1 eligibility criteria is that people living
2 in rural areas can, you know, they have that
3 protection like, Anchorage is urban.

4 Even though I'm Native, I
5 can't -- I'm not qualified. You are
6 qualified because you're from Bethel. If --
7 it's just the way the law is written does
8 not make any distinction between Native and
9 non-Native, so we end up using a term "rural
10 residents." That's the eligibility
11 criteria.

12 Thank you.

13
14 MR. McCANN: (Through
15 interpreter) you should tell that old man,
16 that old man, tell that old man make sure
17 that he understands. I think he
18 understands.

19
20 MR. ALEX NICK: Thank you, Mr.
21 Chairman, I want to clarify what Pete was
22 presenting in Yupik because it was my
23 understanding, that I'm going to translate
24 my own comment into Yupik on behalf of the
25 Elders. Its' my understanding that each
region will discuss the amount that they
want to see the cap, dollar cap, right?
\$1,000 is a figure that the Task Force
members came up with?

16
17 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair, Alex,
18 that's correct. They have the option of
19 identifying a specific amount for their
20 specific region or agree with what the Task
21 Force came up with.

22
23 MR. ALEX NICK: (Through
24 interpreter) What he said, Task Force, well
25 they discussed it, when they were meeting
this summer the \$1,000 limit that was what
they came up with, but your Council and
maybe you will discuss it tomorrow, after
you talk about it, and -- with your Regional
Councils, the amount that was mentioned, you
can -- you can talk about that more tomorrow
when you are in your breakout sessions.

24
25 MR. NICHOLIA: Vince?

MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman,

1 Regional Councils, why don't we take this
2 like we did with the FIS projects and take
3 it piece by piece, okay? And that's been
4 mentioned by Pete and by Carl.

5 The first piece of the
6 regulations is -- or proposed regulations
7 is: Do you agree that there would be no
8 dollar amount, no limit, no cap between
9 trade that goes on between people who live
10 in village to village, rural to rural? Talk
11 about that, and then talk about the next
12 step, which is: Trade between people who
13 live in villages and rural and people who do
14 not live in villages?

15 I think it might be easier if
16 you'd understand that by those steps,
17 because the dollar amount doesn't come into
18 play until the trade is between rural and
19 people or people and villages and people
20 that do not live in villages anymore.

21 So maybe that might be an easier
22 way for you guys just to discuss it.

23 Now, you have opportunity in your
24 breakout sessions to do it, but when you do
25 it in your breakout sessions, you will not
26 have the knowledge of the Eastern and
27 Western will not have the knowledge of the
28 Elders from YK, Yukon/Kuskokwim region and
29 the Yukon/Kuskokwim will not have the
30 knowledge that you possess.

31 So, that's my suggestion. You
32 don't have to follow it, but it would be to
33 look at this in steps.

34 Sam?

35 MR. NICHOLIA: Willard?

36 MR. CHURCH: I'd like a little
37 clarification here on customary trade
38 between rural resident and others. When you
39 use the word "fish" is that processed or
40 unprocessed? Fresh in the ground, frozen, H
41 & G, what are we talking about, is that a
42 limit to dried, smoked, canned, jarred; how
43 is it being defined?

44 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chair,
45 Mr. Church, if you focus your attention, the
46 Task Force specifically wanted to identify
47 what we meant by processed and under 1-11,

1 it means all processing of fish, including
2 the following, but not limited to: Freeing,
3 canning, smoking, salting, drying.

4 What we're trying to do, it's
5 going to encompass however those fish are
6 processed.

7 Mr. Chair?

8 MR. CHURCH: I thought that was
9 specific to customary trade between rural
10 residents. I didn't know it would also
11 apply to rural resident and others. That
12 was some of the clarification that I needed.

13 MR. PROBASCO: Yes, Mr. Chair,
14 Mr. Church, a very good question. It's the
15 way I did when I drafted the language,
16 that's where that word first comes up, so I
17 introduced the definition at that point, but
18 it does apply to the entire regulation.

19 Thank you.
20 Mr. Chair?

21 MR. NICHOLIA: Any questions?

22 MR. SAM: Are you looking for
23 action now that we can unanimously consent
24 to 1 and 3?

25 MR. PROBASCO: Mr. Chairs, I
26 think -- our experience, both Carl's and
27 mine and other people that have presented to
28 the Councils have found that the issue of
29 one and three have been pretty much adopted
30 as written and the discussions have been
31 focusing on No. 2, and based on what
32 Mr. Nicholia said earlier that there's
33 issues within his region that he might want
34 to have specifically addressed, so, Mr. Sam,
35 your recommendation is a good one to follow.
36 But we need clarification so that when we
37 discuss it again as a Task Force, we can
38 understand what the respective Councils are
39 addressing and their concerns.

40 Mr. Chair?

41 MR. NICHOLIA: I think what
42 you're getting at Ron, as three Councils we
43 can agree on 1 and 3, but for my Eastern
44 Interior Council, I'd like to discuss with

1 my own Council, if I get more members
2 between the river and the road system. My
3 Eastern Interior wouldn't agree to it. But
4 as three Councils, we can agree on 1 and 3.
5 Questions?

6 MS. GREGORY: Mr. Chairman, I
7 move that we approve or accept the 1 and 3.

8 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

9 MS. GREGORY: With the No. A-12,
10 we could take that and work it among our own
11 regional RACs before we act on it.
12 Agreed.

13 MR. REAKOFF: Yeah.

14 MR. NICHOLIA: Lester?

15 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: I can't
16 understand what you mean by 1 and 3?

17 MS. GREGORY: A-13 is No. 3.

18 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: 11, 12
19 and 3 in the way I -- I'm sorry. Okay.

20 MS. GREGORY: It's okay, 11A, and
21 A-13 to clarify. Thank you, Lester.

22 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: That's
23 all right.

24 MR. SAM: We can't count when it
25 comes to \$1,000 either.
Question.

MR. NICHOLIA: Motion has been
made, it's been seconded to approve
customary trade for 1-11 and A-13, with the
exclusion of A-12. Leave A-12 up to our own
prospective Councils.

All those in favor of this
motion, signify by saying "aye."

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. NICHOLIA: All those opposed,
same sign.

1 Motion carries.

Go ahead, Pete.

2 Mr. Chair, before I leave, first
3 of all, I thank you again. When you break
4 out in your groups, when you work with the
5 respective OSM staff, be very specific on
6 the language, keep in mind that this is what
the Task Force, the staff committee and what
the Federal Subsistence Board will be doing,
be very specific and that will help us out a
lot.

Mr. Chair. Thank you.

7

MR. NICHOLIA: Ron?

8

9 MR. REAKOFF: Mr. Chair, I want
10 to address the joint Councils on A-12. On
11 the teleconference I stated that I was
12 concerned that during times of low salmon
13 returns that the fish would be sold out of
14 the region for those food -- that food is
15 necessary to be used there. And when we
break out into the Western Council, I'm
going to -- I feel that those fish should
not be sold to other areas when that -- when
that food is necessary in that region. And
I want to bring that out to all the Councils
for consideration when we ultimately break
out.

Thank you.

16

17 MR. NICHOLIA: Any more
questions?

Thank you.

18

19 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chair, that
brings us back to the Kuskokwim, and Rich
Cannon will be presenting on that.

20

MR. MOSES: I'm sorry.

21

22 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, due
23 to time constraints, again, this is the
24 second time at your joint meeting and now
25 here that Mr. Brown, Randy Brown, has been
dealing with the whitefish interaction
project, has been moved on the agenda. He
has a time constraint. I'm asking the
Councils if it would be okay for Mr. Brown
to present his special report on the

1 whitefish interaction which was of high
2 interest to the upper river Councils.

3 MR. NICHOLIA: Is it all right
4 for Councils?

5 MR. SAM: Is it all right with
6 Rich?
7 Thank you.

8 MR. NICHOLIA: Mr. Brown?

9 MR. MATHEWS: While Randy is
10 getting up here, we did have one person that
11 would like to comment on this project, that
12 would be Nick Frank; so, when Randy gets to
13 the end there, if Nick Frank still wants to
14 speak on that, that would -- that would
15 help.

16 Thank you. If anyone knows Nick
17 Frank, and he's not here, let him know that
18 we're starting to talk about the project
19 that he was interested in, I believe,
20 according to the notes I have.

21 MR. ALEX NICK: Vince, I'm
22 checking.

23 MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman,
24 Council, thank you for making time in your
25 schedule for this presentation. This was a
26 project that was funded through the Office
27 of Subsistence Management, and it was a
28 cooperative venture between the Council of
29 Athabaskan Tribal governments and the U.S.
30 Fish & Wildlife Service. I worked with
31 Davey James and Craig Fleener as well as a
32 couple other folks out of Fort Yukon to do
33 this project.

34 It's entitled "The Influence of
35 Beaver Dams on Fish Distribution in the
36 Black River Drainage." Since there are
37 lower river folks here, I should point out
38 this is the Yukon Flats River, Black River,
39 way up in the interior of the State.

40 I'll be covering a few things
41 today. Discussion on the concerns that have
42 been voiced regarding beaver dams, fish.
43 I'll talk about some other studies that have

1 been done on this issue.

2 We'll go through the objectives
3 of the study, the study site, the methods we
4 used and some of the results.

5 Now, the issue with beaver dams
6 and whitefish, there's two possibilities.
7 The first one is that fish become trapped in
8 a pond behind a dam and are unable to get
9 out to a river and this could potentially be
10 a problem if they had to get out to a river
11 to escape a wintering situation that they
12 couldn't survive it.

13 Although it's unclear how you
14 would determine whether they would have
15 problems in the lake during the winter just
16 by looking.

17 The other possibility is that
18 fish will be trapped out or refused entry
19 into ponds because of a dam, and I'm not
20 sure how that would harm the fish except
21 that they might not have access to a feeding
22 area. Northern pike might spawn in the
23 lake, but the whitefish generally wouldn't.
24 So it wouldn't be a spawning issue.

25 We aren't the first ones to have
looked at this. Quite a number of studies
from Southeast Alaska all the way down to
the Appalachian Mountains and Rockies have
looked at the same issue. In general, what
they found is that beaver dams increase the
habitat availability. Rather than just the
river system running through the valley, you
have the river system and then pond waters
and so what they have is a more different
species of fish present in the valley.

They found that some fish prefer
to be in ponds and lakes rather than out in
the river, and the juvenile fish were much
more common in the ponds than they were out
in river habitat.

In addition, there were a number
of studies that plotted the water regimes on
stream systems and found that fish were able
to routinely move across dams because of
high water. And there were a number of
studies that did document winter kill in
some beaver ponds. In other words fish were
trapped in there. They knew they were in
there and there were some fish killed before
the end of winter.

1 Generally, this is a low oxygen
2 situation in a pond capped with ice, and
3 they found that it affected adult fish much
4 more than juvenile fish. The juvenile fish
5 seemed to survive these periods.

6 So, in one study, obviously, we
7 aren't going to answer all the questions on
8 whether beaver dams are good or whether
9 beaver dams are bad, but in response to the
10 concerns, we thought, well, let's go out and
11 find out what fish are there, are they
12 utilizing these habitats, and so we were
13 going to select three lake systems with the
14 dam across the outlet streams in one of the
15 wetland areas in the State, and we were
16 going to identify the fish species that we
17 were able to capture within the ponds and
18 out on the stream system nearby. And then
19 compare the ages and the sizes of fish in
20 both places and find out if there were a
21 preference of certain age classes or
22 species.

23 And then we would document the
24 frequency and duration of high-water events
25 in the system, interests that would have
26 allowed fish to move back and forth.

27 So, our study area is in the
28 Upper Yukon Valley. The Black River
29 drainage flows out of the Ogilvie Mountains
30 into the Porcupine River, not far from the
31 Yukon, you can see the Tanana here. It's a
32 long ways into the drainage, the lower Black
33 River has quite a number of pond systems,
34 old oxbow, pretty flat area.

35 This is a high-altitude aerial
36 photo of the study site that was lowest in
37 the system, and as you can see, it's a great
38 big oxbows off of the Black River. The
39 Black River is flowing downstream this way.
40 Obviously, at one point it flowed around
41 this lake and right now there's a small
42 entryway that was about 30 or 40-feet wide
43 and it had a beaver dam on that system that
44 during low water periods blocked fish
45 movement.

46 This was our next study site, and
47 it was about 30 miles farther upriver than
48 the first. Again, it's an old oxbow, the
49 Black River is flowing downriver this way,
50 and it's got a long entry channel.

1 This is a one kilometer bar and
2 roughly -- this is about a mile from the
3 river all the way into the lake, mile or a
4 little more than a mile.

5 But actually, this channel, this
6 lake habitat as well, because the dam is
7 down near the entrance of this pond.

8 And one of the qualities of these
9 two lakes are that there's no real stream
10 system in either this one or the first study
11 lake. It's kind of flatland country. So,
12 they are flooded by the river to come over
13 the dam rather than from flow inside. It's
14 a stream system.

15 And then the third study lake was
16 farther up in the drainage, another 30 miles
17 farther than the middle one. And the Black
18 River flows this way across this slide.

19 Again, this lake is an old stream
20 bed, quite a bit older than the other two,
21 though, and the dam is way back at the lake
22 which is about two miles away from the
23 river. We accessed by pulling a canoe over
24 this narrow stretch into the lake, but this
25 is a more complicated system because there
is water flow. This stream up here flows
into the lake and there's other water
flowing in to this system as well.

So, water actually did flow over
the dam sometimes here allowing fish to be
able to go if they wanted to.

So, what we did is take two
gillnets, two-inch mesh gillnet and
four-inch gillnet, so we can catch six or
eight-inch fish, as well as fish as large as
they would come. And we sampled with both
nets in the lake and both nets in the river
three different times during the summer in
early June, shortly after breakup, in
mid-July, or late July, and then in
mid-September just to get a feel for whether
there was some change over the course of the
summer.

And we set the nets for two to
four hours each time. And the reason some
of them were set for only two is we were
catching so many fish, we didn't want to
impact the lakes. For example, if the water
was low enough that the dams blocked fish
from moving out or coming in, then we fished

1 for a whole day. For example, we might
2 catch 500 fish in that lake. The next time
3 we come in there may be very many fewer fish
4 in the lake, so we didn't want to affect the
population that much. Just get a graph
sample of the different species that were
there.

5 All the fish were identified,
6 measured and aged, and we noted the food --
whether they were eating or not, and what
the food was when we could.

7 And then we compared the catches
8 from the lakes with that from the river, and
we also had some water level monitoring
9 devices in each of the lakes so we could
track when water came over the dams and they
were -- fish had access between river and
lake habitat.

10 So, a tally of all the fish
11 captured during the total time in the
project is on this page here, and you'll see
12 that we had -- northern pike were the most
commonly caught fish, and we caught 108 in
the lake system, and only 52 in the river.

13 Similarly, humpback whitefish
14 were more common in the lakes, with 42 in
the lakes and 20 on the river. Cisco were
15 caught in the lake systems, and broad
whitefish, common. We did catch a single
16 sheefish in a lake and we caught a single
Arctic grayling out on the river. Two
17 hybrid whitefish were caught in the a lake.
Hybrids are a mix of two different species,
18 generally that happens not because they want
to spawn together, because the two species
are spawning in the same space and they
19 accidentally fertilize each other.

20 It shows how closely they're
related, the different species are related,
but it also tells you that those two species
21 are spawning at the same time in the same
place. We know very few spawning areas
22 where these whitefish are. This is curious
information for that reason.

23 You can see 206 fish total caught
24 in the lakes and only 80 caught in the river
during the same period.

25 Now, this is obviously a northern
pike, everybody has seen this. But as a
fisherman, you can find out a lot about

1 different fish species in a place based on
2 what they got in their bellies. A lot of
3 times they -- we have no idea what they're
4 eating. We did examine northern pike
5 studies. 30 centimeters is about one foot
6 for those metrically challenged. In the
7 sciences we're bound to use metric.

8 If we examine the prey by the
9 northern pike, by the species of the prey
10 and the habitat of the consumer. If the
11 pike was caught in a lake, the prey would be
12 in this column, and in the river, it would
13 be in this column. Pike like to eat each
14 other. The fish in the lake were eating
15 much more than the fish in the river were.
16 40 food items from the pike in the lakes
17 were other northern pike, a number of
18 others, 29 unidentified whitefish. They
19 were partially digested. You can clearly
20 see they're whitefish, not what species.
21 There was an Arctic lamprey. This was a
22 parasitic lamprey. 43 centimeters, 18
23 inches, had parasitic mouth parts,
24 indicating it had been to sea and was
25 returning. Sometimes I think we look at
these inland systems as if we have local
fish, but a lot of these fish travel long
distance and also the pike had three suckers
in their bellies, and we didn't catch any of
those in our nets.

16 There were other fish around.

17 And 75 food items, fish food
18 items caught from pike in lakes, only three
19 from pike caught in the rivers.

20 Now we hear stories about pike
21 eating Muskrats and pike eating baby ducks
22 and such, but this, you mark your -- mark my
23 words, this is when you hear that pike eat
24 eagles, this is a baby eagle that was taken
25 from one of the pike stomachs in one of the
lakes. We actually had two pike that had
baby eagles in the bellies in this project.
I thought it was kind of a curiosity.

20 Two of the other fish players in
21 this drama here are humpback whitefish,
22 which you're all familiar with, I'm sure.
23 And broad whitefish. We caught a number of
24 fine adults.

25 And then ciscoes, much smaller
species. This is a full adult.

1 Again, 30 centimeters is about a
2 foot long and again, we caught these almost
3 entirely in the lakes.

4 Now, since we had the nets in for
5 somewhat variable periods of time, in fish
6 biology, we generally standardize so you can
7 compare catches by a catch per unit effort
8 or CPUE. That's a catch rate. Fish that
9 you catch in an hour of net time is how this
10 works, and so to compare the lake and river
11 habitats, the catch rates and the latent
12 river habitats, I broke it out here by the
13 sample period and then by lake and river
14 habitats, and you'll see this through each
15 sample period we caught more fish per hour
16 in lakes than we did in the river.

17 And, again, if we look by
18 species, we have more fish caught per hour
19 of net time in the lakes than we did in the
20 river.

21 It's very clear the lakes are
22 being selected by these fish.

23 When we get down to actual sample
24 sites, though, we start seeing a difference,
25 and we'll get into why that is here in just
26 a minute.

27 But site L, which was the lowest
28 one on the river also had the lowest dam and
29 was most open to the influence of the river.
30 And the catch rates in that lake were
31 virtually the same as the river, and the age
32 classes of the fish were virtually the same.

33 Site M, the second lake up the
34 system, I had dramatically different catch
35 rates in the lake than in the river, and
36 also the age structure of those fish. Many
37 more young fish in that lake than in the
38 river or in the other lakes. And the upper
39 lake, which was the most complex in that it
40 had stream flowing in and was farther away
41 from the river, it had a greater catch rate
42 than the river, but it was dominated by less
43 ciscoes alone. There were no humpback
44 whitefish, no -- only a few juvenile, in
45 addition to less ciscoes. Really different
46 lake systems.

47 So, this is a graph of water
48 level changes for these different lake
49 systems through the summer. Now, when the
50 line moves horizontal across this graph,

1 this is the date, so we have time moving
2 from early June to mid-September along the X
3 axis and the water level from low to high
4 along the Y axis, when these lines are
5 moving horizontal it means there is not very
6 much exchange in the water level in the
7 lake. It's staying relatively stable. When
8 you have a high water event the river
9 floods, you get a rapid rise in the water
10 level in the lake, and there was a flood
11 event in August, mid-August that affected
12 all three lakes. The water from the river
13 came up and over the dams and into all three
14 lakes, when I matched the high points for
15 all three water level monitoring devices
16 right there, it allows me to look at the
17 relative difference in dam heights for the
18 three systems.

19 You can see site L actually when
20 I showed this slide to folks in my office,
21 some of them are color blind and they
22 couldn't see this orange line at all. I
23 hope nobody is color blind.

24 But the site L had the lowest dam
25 and you can see that it has a constantly
26 changing water level through the summer.
27 Actually, in these low periods, the dam is
28 blocking fish movement, but it's so close to
29 river level at low water that the river
30 doesn't have to rise very much and fish can
31 move back and forth. By contrast, site M
32 had a much higher dam and it was only open
33 to fish movement on three different
34 occasions. And site U, the one with the
35 stream flowing through it, had the highest
36 dam and when we actually put the water level
37 monitor in, initially about a foot of water
38 was flowing over the top of the dam and out
39 even though the river water level was low.
40 Fish couldn't move back and forth then.

41 So, the numbers that go along
42 with these are here from the different lakes
43 in these columns and we have the start day
44 and the stop day, the total days we were
45 monitoring the water level, 90 or 95 days
46 for each system. I plotted the days when
47 fish could move back and forth as the days
48 open and so Lake L with the lowest dam was
49 open 59 percent of the time, five different
50 lengthy events.

1 Lake M with the next lowest --
2 next highest dam was open only 14 percent of
3 the time. The fish going into Lake M really
4 didn't have many opportunities to leave that
5 lake. Only three events where they could
6 during the period we were watching.

7 And only two events in the
8 uppermost lake for about 22 percent of the
9 time. Remember about 13 days of that 20 was
10 water pouring over the dam and only seven
11 days was the river flooding back over.

12 So, if we examine the age
13 composition of fish caught in lakes and
14 rivers, for northern -- I back these out by
15 species because they have such different age
16 distributions with these different species.
17 So with northern pike, we find that age 1
18 and 2 fish were caught only in the lakes.
19 These are the ages in years along the X axis
20 and the number fish along the Y axis, you
21 can see 62 fish, 62 age 1 pike caught in the
22 lakes, and no age 1 pike caught out on the
23 rivers at all. Even though we were using
24 the same gear.

25 If we look at humpback whitefish
26 age structure, all of these adults from age
27 8 up were caught in the June sampling period
28 and we couldn't catch a single one anywhere
29 after that other than the age 1 juveniles
30 which we caught in one of the lakes in
31 September. And I think they just grew big
32 enough to be vulnerable to the gear at that
33 point in time and they were probably there
34 all along.

35 Humpback whitefish generally make
36 spawning maturity around five to eight years
37 old, and these were all obviously mature
38 fish.

39 And you notice there is a bunch
40 of age classes missing in here, and they
41 obviously would have been big enough to
42 catch with our gear, and so the implication
43 is that they are somewhere else. They're
44 not in that system there at that time.

45 It might be important to note
46 that humpback whitefish do make runs into
47 the ocean and back in some systems, and so
48 it's possible these fish are a long ways
49 away as juveniles.

50 Least cisco, they age spawning

1 mature at around age 3. We only caught one
2 fish out in the river, this just sort of
3 diagrams the age structure of these guys,
4 the oldest one around nine years old. The
5 age 1s and 2s were all immature fish, all
6 caught in lakes, and the broad whitefish.
7 Again, like humpback whitefish, they
8 sometimes make long migrations, one thing to
9 note is that the youngest fish out on the
10 river was age 5, and we had a number of
11 fish, juveniles that were caught in the
12 lakes only.

13 So, to summarize our findings in
14 this, we did catch more fish in around --
15 the catch rate was greater in lake habitat
16 than in the rivers, juvenile fish were
17 captured only in the lakes. Fish did have
18 opportunity to leave during at least two
19 occasions on all of these lakes. And
20 possibly more because we didn't get their
21 breakup, and there was possibly high water
22 in the fall that allowed them out.

23 The two beaver ponds that were
24 most isolated really had the different fish
25 fauna, age distribution and fish
26 distribution from the river. The one beaver
27 pond that was open to the community most of
28 the summer, had identical that was most
29 different to the river, without juveniles
30 and such.

31 What can we take from this,
32 similar to the other studies, beaver dams do
33 seem to stabilize the water level. The two
34 ponds that were left affected by the water
35 rise in the river had a stable shoreline
36 with shoreline vegetation, whereas the one
37 that was going up and down all the time, it
38 was all big, high segmented graphs, there
39 wasn't ever a stable shoreline in that. We
40 did find that certain fish species, like the
41 least cisco preferred the lake, the young
42 fish of all different species preferred the
43 lake habitat over the river. That suggests
44 that this lake habitat may be important to
45 rearing and successful growth of these fish.

46 And so, if we were to develop a
47 hypothesis for an additional study, it might
48 be that the more isolated the pond is from
49 the river, the more unique the fish spawna
50 might be. We might find different species

1 or age classes than the river.

2 From this study, I didn't think
3 we had any reason to believe that these
4 beaver dams were detrimental to the fish
5 populations, although, I do recognize that
6 there may be some situations where fish died
7 through winter kill being stuck behind
8 these.

9 But I think if people were to
10 remove dams thinking they were doing the
11 fish some good by doing that, they may be
12 compromising juveniles that were living in
13 that pond and needed it to stay that way.
14 Each pond -- these ponds were each different
15 and so I think each pond anywhere else might
16 be different as well.

17 And we haven't been able to
18 identify this one, but he seems to have
19 adapted to beaver dams just fine.

20 (Laughter.)

21 I'll take questions if anybody
22 has any.

23 MR. NICK: You made that, right?

24 MR. BROWN: Yes. Computer
25 programs are great these days.

MR. NICHOLIA: How much did this
study cost?

MR. BROWN: This was a -- this
was a one-year study, and I believe it was
about \$45,000 of which I believe two thirds
or so went to CATG. And they did all the
operations. We -- I went out and did some
of the sampling and organized the gear and
wrote the project up, but the CATG hired two
or three people that actually ran the boats
and did the sampling with me up the river.

MR. SAM: The reason I ask that,
it just confirmed our knowledge or beliefs
all along.

24 Thank you.

25 MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, I
have a question. This study, particular

1 study doesn't seem to get at the problem as
2 defined by the Elders in the area I'm in,
3 the Upper Kuskokwim. What they report is
4 that, for instance, Morrison Lake used to
5 have a healthy population of broad
6 whitefish, lake whitefish, but that there
7 are no broad whitefish in that lake and they
8 attribute it to the fact that it's now
9 blocked off by several beaver dams. It's a
10 loss of habitat due to beaver dams, you
11 couldn't measure that by looking whether or
12 not. You could confirm whether or not
13 they're not there now. What I'm thinking is
14 they use the lakes for breeding or so on, so
15 actually the lakes would contribute to a
16 higher river population, but if we're losing
17 whole lakes now that can no longer be used,
18 it would seem the whole system was being
19 depressed? You see what I mean? Is there
20 anything like that in the area that was
21 reported up there, where there are no longer
22 fish where they say there were in the past?
23 That's what was reported to me.

13 MR. BROWN: Thank you for the
14 question, Mr. Collins. I don't -- I think
15 we need to actually look at the history of
16 these fish just a little bit. I know there
17 are people that believe they spawn in some
18 of these lakes, and there may be some that
19 they do, but the spawning area the we know
20 about for virtually all the whitefish are in
21 rivers. And so these fish spawn in the
22 fall, all whitefish spawn in the fall,
23 usually late September, October. Broad
24 whitefish actually spawn much later, in
25 October or November. And the eggs they
brought cast them out into gravel in the
stream and the eggs sit there all winter and
they emerge again in the spring.

21 So, rare lake -- it has to be a
22 big enough lake that it has water coming
23 through the gravel or gravel beach to it in
24 order to support these eggs surviving in the
25 lake habitat. Northern pike do spawn in the
lakes in the spring, and they take advantage
of high water after breakup to get in there.

I suppose if there were something
preventing high water from allowing fish to
move over those dams, you could -- you know,

1 that might cause those broad whitefish not
2 to go in to those lakes you're speaking of.

3 We found fish everywhere we set a
4 net. And when the -- when the humpback
5 whitefish and the broad whitefish left after
6 June, nowhere could we catch them, but they
7 were there in June, big numbers. Like I
8 say, I've actually been working on another
9 project that was funded by the subsistence
10 office on humpback whitefish and we've been
11 head-tagging them, and they move a long
12 distance into lakes and out of lakes and up
13 rivers and down rivers. They don't sit
14 still that much, so it wouldn't bother me
15 that we don't catch those humpbacks in June
16 or September. I think they're somewhere
17 else.

18 We caught fish pretty much
19 everywhere we went.

20 James?

21 MR. CHARLES: Thank you,
22 Mr. Chairman. Did your study just do three
23 lakes or did you study more lakes or rivers
24 than what you showed up there?

25 MR. BROWN: We -- we limited our
study to those three lakes and the river
near those three lakes as a preliminary
step.

When we first began this project,
we didn't really know what to expect. It
was actually much more difficult than we
imagined to find three lake systems that had
beaver dams blocking the entryways. I know
that late in the year people find them when
we were going out in the spring, though, it
was quite challenging, and I attribute our
success in this project to Chris James out
at Fort Yukon. He knew the Black River back
and forth and knew where these systems were.

I will point out, though, that
there were many other lakes there that did
not have dams blocking access, but they did
have gravel bars blocking access when high
water came up it allowed fish in and then it
would drop and they couldn't get out. Or a
stream system that dried up completely even
though there were no beaver dams on it.

So, there's other lakes they

1 could get stuck in. But it would be good to
2 go to lakes without beaver dams and expand
3 the study or study these lakes more in depth
4 to understand what's going on, for example,
5 with that lake that had all the juvenile
6 fish in it and see whether they stayed there
7 through the winter, whether they survive the
8 winter, things like that.

9 MR. CHARLES: How about salmon?
10 Did you find any salmon -- behind that dams?
11 Two weeks ago, Billy and I went hunting and
12 this stream, Holitna, and it has a dam on
13 it, and I saw a little fish -- something,
14 something behind that dam. That, I think,
15 has salmon that the stream may have salmon
16 spawning in there because salmon goes up the
17 Holitna, and I was wondering if salmon are
18 trapped like that too in some streams off
19 the main rivers. And back home where I come
20 from flat country, but beavers move in over
21 there and dam the creeks and sloughs over
22 there where there used to be whitefish and
23 black fish. And we don't have black fish
24 anymore in some streams where there used to
25 be and no more whitefish, only the
26 humpbacks.

27 MR. BROWN: Well, the salmon,
28 we'll touch base on that first.

29 Down in the Southeast Alaska on
30 the Taku River there have been extensive
31 studies looking at beaver dams and river
32 habitat, and they have found that the coho
33 salmon, the silvers down there favor the
34 beaver dams, beaver ponds over every other
35 habitat, and virtually all of them are found
36 in the ponds.

37 They leave the river to go into
38 the beaver ponds. So they believe that the
39 beaver ponds are critical to those coho fry
40 surviving. And they stay there through the
41 winter. Of course, there's high water and
42 they're able to get out at various times.
43 And I would contend that even if there were
44 salmon behind the dam, it would be a long
45 reach to assume that they were in trouble
46 because of it.

47 As far as the beavers moving in
48 and black fish and broad whitefish, these

1 are great questions, and observations, but I
2 certainly can't answer that.

3 We didn't -- we didn't see that
4 there was any problem. We had broad
5 whitefish in and out of the dams, and they
6 seem to deal with it just fine.

7 MR. NICHOLIA: Benedict?

8 MR. JONES: Yeah, I just wanted
9 to know the difference between the quality
10 of the fish between the lakes and the river
11 or the fish in the lakes; are they better
12 condition than the river? And if so, are
13 they fatter than the river fish?

14 MR. BROWN: The adult humpback
15 whitefish and broad whitefish were really
16 captured only in June. They left the system
17 after that and so we only caught juveniles
18 of those species after that.

19 They were -- they were both
20 reasonably fat but not fat like they are in
21 the fall. The least ciscoes we caught in
22 only one lake in any numbers and they were
23 extremely fat. They were very good eating,
24 and actually the folk from Chalkyitsik go
25 and harvest those fish out of that lake and
say they're the best.

MR. NICHOLIA: John?

MR. HANSON: Yeah, thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

Are you going to be doing any
studies at the Yukon Delta and Kuskokwim
Delta?

MR. BROWN: Well, I've been asked
to and we're working on some projects that
might find us down there. I guess the
Council thinks there's merit to doing
further work down there. I would be open to
some suggestions on what the concerns are
and how we might go about it, but we might
be able to arrange something if there are
some concerns.

MR. HANSON: I think there should
be some work done around the Kuskokwim Delta

1 and the Yukon Delta. We have a lot of
2 spawning rivers that brought the whitefish
3 and other species that go in and in some of
4 those streams there are beaver dams that
5 five, six, just one after the other, and
6 those streams, they go into big lakes where
7 broad fish and other species go in. And
8 then on the -- those streams have little
9 streams on the side that go into lakes where
10 black fish go and those are dammed
11 especially on the Yukon, there's a lot of
12 dams all over. Lots of them go to a stream
13 that I used to go in for salmon berries for
14 my family. I had to break six dams. A week
15 later I went back, those were -- they
16 weren't small ones, they were big ones, they
17 fix them up so I wouldn't break them.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. HANSON: I'd never seen that
20 kind of fish or caught that kind of fish
21 over them broad fish.
22 Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
24 Sampson?

25 MR. HENRY: We might have beaver
problems. Last year on the Koyukuk River,
we might have lost between 70 to 80 percent
of beaver because of cold weather and no
snow and all their feed was frozen into the
ice, and they had to come out in the middle
of winter to get feed, and wolverine, fox,
wolves whatever, it's almost wiped them out.
And whatever beaver, some of the people
caught, was so skinny, the beaver was just
about maybe four, five inches wide. They
were so skinny. And recently I came up from
Kotlik all the way to Nenana and all I saw
was one beaver, and I went so slow that I
could see the streams and trees or whatever
about ten times.

23 So I was looking at almost
24 everything, and so I think we're going to
really lose beaver.

25 MR. NICHOLIA: More questions?
We'll recognize Orville.

1
2 MR. HANSON: Couldn't --
3 couldn't -- Orville Hanson, mostly I work.
4 Ann Catherine shared a story with me about a
5 landlocked lake where there was whitefish.
6 There was a lot of whitefish like Ray was
7 saying. One year, there was a big flood,
8 and once pike got in there, there's -- they
9 got locked in there and there was only pike
10 after that, there was no more whitefish.
11 You could get that story from her probably
12 better than me.

13
14 MR. NICHOLIA: More questions?
15 Thank you.

16
17 MR. BROWN: Thank you.
18 I wonder if Laura is waiting for
19 us or not.

20
21 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, I
22 believe Tom Kron had contacted her about
23 that, and advised her that you guys are
24 burning the midnight oil. So she's aware of
25 that, and I assume she's sympathetic to your
situation. Maybe Tom has an update on that.
She is aware that there's people not going
to arrive at her house at 7:00.

26
27 MR. NICHOLIA: Okay. There's one
28 more thing I want to mention, since this
29 deal with the Kuskokwim River. I'm going to
30 hand the Chair back over to Ron.

31
32 MR. SAM: Thanks. What page,
33 Rich, on the proposals?

34
35 MR. MATHEWS: It's D-1. D-1 in
36 your book and Rich can I take a moment to
37 kind of get things back to where I can begin
38 my presentation. I have a few handouts to
39 also provide for you as well.

40
41 I just got a big error message
42 here, Sam, Rich. How long do you think this
43 will take? I'm getting some --

44
45 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman, like
46 on the Yukon, I have my presentation divided
47 into two sections, one on the status report

1 on existing projects, and then on the 2002
2 project recommendations. And the
3 presentations themselves take about 15
minutes per presentation. And then, of
course, there will be time for discussion.

4 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman,
5 I'll -- I believe everyone has received
6 copies of the handouts, and I'll begin my
presentation now.

7 MR. SAM: Go right ahead.

8 MR. CANNON: Thank you. My name
9 is Richard Cannon. As you know, I work with
10 the Fisheries Information Service division
11 Office of Subsistence Management. As we did
12 for the Yukon, I will be presenting two
reports for the Kuskokwim region. The first
will be a fisheries project performance
report, and the second will be the draft
FY2002 Fisheries Monitoring Plan.

13 To begin, I want to refer to two
14 documents which you -- we -- which will
15 provide you the supporting information
16 concerning the performance report for the
existing Kuskokwim fisheries projects your
program is currently funding.

17 Please refer to the light orange
document titled 2001 Fisheries Resource
Monitoring Plan.

18 It's this document here
(indicating).

19 This report will brief you about
20 the present status of fisheries projects
your program has funded for the Kuskokwim
region to date. There is an executive
summary on page 3 followed in numeric order
by project performance summaries prepared by
the investigators themselves.

21 I will be going through some of
22 this information with you and will attempt
23 to cover the highlights, the successes and
some problems that have been encountered
with the projects.

24 You've already received your
25 issues and information report and I've also
provided a copy of my -- the slides that
I'll be using in my presentation.

As a review, Council members will

1 remember that the FY200 Monitoring Plan was
2 really a startup effort which in the
3 Kuskokwim region focused on extending
4 existing projects, for example, like weirs
5 where we extended the projects to count
6 cohos as well as funding well established
7 needs. We hope in FY2001 to provide more
8 opportunity for Council and local
9 involvement. In 2001, we were really -- we
10 were greatly helped by a local effort in
11 your region by the Kuskokwim fisheries
12 resource coalition which is made up by ABC
13 P, KNA, ONC, and local State and Federal
14 agency staff in your region who work
15 together to provide joint project
16 recommendations.

17 This coalition really stressed
18 cooperation to do more for subsistence users
19 and the fisheries resources.

20 This was really a big help to our
21 program in 2001.

22 Four projects funded in FY2000
23 were completed this past year. Reports had
24 been provided to our office for these
25 projects. In each case, these projects were
done as educational or pilot feasibility
studies and were followed up by studies
funded in FY2001. These projects helped us
to improve and understand the work that we
needed to do.

I will now go over the status of
the 23 projects funded in FY2000 and FY2001
that operated or will operate in the
Kuskokwim region this year.

Four projects originally funded
in FY2000 received 183 -- \$183,000 for
continued work in 2001.

These were the Goodnews River
weir extension project, the Kwethluk River
weir, Tatlawiksuk River weir, and escapement
survey project.

Your program provided \$1.5
million for Kuskokwim projects in 2001.
Those were projects that you approved last
February.

Nine fisheries biology or stock
status and trend studies were funded. These
included the Kanektok River weir relocation
project, the Tuluksak River beaver project,
whitefish studies in whitefish lake near

1 Aniak, and escapement monitoring
2 capacity-building project, a Holitna salmon
3 escapement study, Kuskokwim River chinook
4 stock biology project, and the local
5 fisheries student internship program.

6 Funds were also provided for the
7 Kuskokwim salmon management working group
8 and for state biologists to assist staff
9 from Native organizations like KNYONC, AVCP,
10 and the McGrath Tribal Council.

11 Seven projects funded this year
12 supported salmon escapement monitoring. As
13 this slide shows, our fisheries monitoring
14 program is supporting a number of weir
15 projects in the Kuskokwim.

16 These are five of the eight
17 salmon weir projects currently operated in
18 the Kuskokwim region. Only the George and
19 Takatna River weirs are not receiving funds
20 from our program.

21 I'll be talking about technician
22 support in the weir. These weirs
23 approved -- will be very important to
24 fishery management and Kuskokwim management
25 resources for a long time to come.

26 As you look down the third
27 column, which is indicated by investigators,
28 you can see that weir projects show strong
29 participation by local Federal, State, and
30 Tribal organizations.

31 Tribal and local hire fishery
32 staff are working at all of these sites.
33 Our goal is to have Tribal groups who
34 usually run many of these projects choose to
35 do so in the future.

36 High water after breakup delayed
37 installation of the Kwethluk, Tuluksak, and
38 Kanektok weirs. Because of the old because
39 of the high water, escapement counts for
40 king salmon were not obtained at these
41 projects.

42 Complete counts for chum salmon
43 were also missed at the Kanektok and
44 Tuluksak weirs. However, coho salmon
45 escapements were obtained at all projects.

46 This slide will show you what the
47 high water conditions looked like at many of
48 the Kuskokwim weir projects this past
49 season. But I want to assure you that the
50 Kwethluk weir shown in this slide is really

1 operating as it's supposed to.

2 Most of the weir is underwater
3 allowing debris to flow over the top so the
4 weir does not get washed out.

5 Now, when the water goes down,
6 the weir pops back up again and the crew can
7 begin to count fish again.

8 This is Robert Michael from
9 Kwethluk sitting on a holding pen used to
10 count fish on the weir. We didn't leave him
11 out there. We just wanted to have the
12 picture taken.

13 This slide is of an operating
14 weir at lower water levels and it was taken
15 just a day later at the new Kanektok River
16 weir site. That's Spencer Rearden from
17 Bethel counting coho salmon at that project.

18 Two other projects supported
19 escapement monitoring.

20 Project 30, Fish & Game and Fish
21 & Wildlife Service received funds to do
22 aerial in both surveys to look for new
23 escapement monitoring sites in areas
24 presently not covered.

25 This past summer, surveys were
conducted during August of the upper Aniak
tributaries and the middle Holitna drainage.
Some potential new sites were identified.

Project 141 is the Holitna River
chinook escapement monitoring study. This
was initiated by the Department of Fish &
Game and KNA, this past summer.

This radio tagging project will
provide for the first time a total
escapement estimate for the king, chum, and
coho salmon spawning in the Holitna River
drainage. See, in the past we only had one
weir. This project will give us an estimate
of all of the fish going up in that
drainage.

Three other stocks status and
trend studies are addressing important
fisheries data needs in the region. Project
116 is a Kuskokwim salmon working group
support project. This project is providing
funds for the working group to organize
their weekly meetings and share information
with organizations and community
representatives. Working group met over 20
times this year to share information and to

1 make recommendations to State and Federal
fisheries managers.

2 Project 70. Kuskokwim king
salmon stock biology project.

3 The Alaska Department of Fish &
Game's genetics lab is developing the
4 capability to identify Kuskokwim king stocks
and mix stock fisheries using genetic
5 markers. Baseline samples from five stocks
were collected during the field season this
6 past year summer. Again, high water in the
Kuskokwim prevented sampling in four other
7 sampling areas that they wanted to get to
but could not.

8 Lab work is beginning this fall.
Kuskokwim Native Association is providing
9 technician support and will include this
genetics work in their ongoing fisheries
10 education program.

They'll actually have one of
11 their staff members come to the lab this
year to help with the lab work here in
12 Anchorage.

Project 52, the whitefish study
13 was delayed this spring due to the need for
securing a land lease. Using the weir and
14 fish tag, KNA and U.S. Fish & Wildlife will
develop abundance of study distribution
15 system and the population of whitefish that
summer in Whitefish Lake.

16 The weir was installed by the end
of September and now the crew is waiting for
17 the out migration of the whitefish prior to
breakup.

18 The Fish & Wildlife Service is
providing a crew leader and KNA is providing
19 fisheries technicians.

Other projects focus primarily on
20 education, training and local
capacity-building of Tribal staff.

21 Project 86. Kuskokwim escapement
weir support project. This project provides
22 funding for ONC Tribal employees to receive
on the job training and learn about fish
23 counting projects. Alexei was selected from
a large field containing several
24 well-qualified candidates to fill this
position. He will provide all aspects of
25 day-to-day aspects. And did a really good
job.

1 Project 88, again, we had a very
2 thorough, very good briefing on that, so
3 I'll touch on it. This is natural resource
4 internship program, and KNA, as you heard,
5 trained 11 village youth this past summer.
6 The interns were taught basic salmon
7 management, conservation concepts.
8 Contributed to their education and the
9 potential for having summer jobs in the
10 future.

11 This objective is achieved
12 through hands-on learning at the weir sites.

13 Project 117 is a stock assessment
14 research capacity-building project. The
15 Council's recommendation, this project
16 supported expanded Department of Fish & Game
17 efforts to train and provide assistance to
18 Tribal groups in the Kuskokwim region who
19 want to do these kind of fishery studies.

20 So the Department of Fish & Game
21 actually brought on some additional staff
22 people who work full-time just in working
23 with the Tribal groups.

24 Ten harvest monitoring and TEK
25 projects were initiated in 2001. These
included an upper river community TEK and
harvest assessment project. And Aniak
subsistence TEK fishery study. A TEK
project as Nunapitchuk.

 An upper river in-season harvest
survey project. Also one in-season harvest
project for the middle Kuskokwim, and one
for the lower Kuskokwim.

 A Bethel post-season subsistence
survey, and Aniak River rod and reel fish
survey. A subregional planning meeting that
will be held in the Upper, Middle, and Lower
Kuskokwim.

 And a subsistence research
capacity development project.

 Five fisheries harvest monitoring
projects were supported in 2001. Three of
these studies were in-season subsistence
harvest monitoring projects. This important
work was carried out this season by McGrath
Native Village Council in the Upper
Kuskokwim, that's project 23. KNA in the
Middle Kuskokwim is project 225, and ONC in
the Lower Kuskokwim, project 132.

 These projects provided valuable

1 in-season information about subsistence
2 harvests and migration of salmon runs this
3 past season. That information was given to
4 the Kuskokwim working group.

5 Subsistence division with the
6 Alaska Department of Fish & Game provided
7 tech cap assistance and training to these
8 groups.

9 Not having reliable and safe
10 boats and motors for survey crews limited
11 the number of fish camps and fishing
12 families that could be contacted during the
13 season.

14 We will help McGrath obtain a
15 boat and a motor and a VHF radio for this
16 next season.

17 You see that in Project 23, that
18 was a concern that they had. They needed a
19 boat and motor.

20 There was a concern also that ONC
21 had their boat damaged, but we were able to
22 work with them so they were able to get --
23 to purchase a new boat for that project, and
24 finally, KNA had their skiff delivered late
25 in the season, but they did get it in so
we'll be all set to go for next season.
Everybody will have the boats that they
need.

Project 24 is the Bethel
post-season subsistence harvest survey
project. Subsistence division ADF&G will be
training and assisting ONC staff to conduct
a post-season fishery subsistence harvest
survey in Bethel this fall.

The goal is to prepare ONC to
take over this survey project in the future.

Project 147 is the Aniak rod and
reel harvest survey project conducted by the
Alaska Department of Fish & Game sport
fisheries and KNA, and they monitor the
amount of rod and reel fishing effort on the
Aniak River this past summer. There's a
concern there by local subsistence users
about the increased level of rod and reel
fishing occurring on that river.

High water and the Federal
fishing restrictions decreased the amount of
sport fishing so the estimates of rod and
reel fishing activity that was determined
this past summer is probably not

1 representative of more normal years.

2 TEK studies will begin later this
3 year. These projects haven't started yet in
4 Aniak, Nunapitchuk, Lake Minchumina, Telida,
5 and Nikolai. These projects will generally
6 collect information during the late fall,
7 winter and spring before the fish runs
8 begin.

9 For this reason, the number of
10 these projects are still in the planning
11 phase with the actual work starting later
12 this fall and winter.

13 Finally, two other projects will
14 support local community and Tribal
15 participation in this program. Projects --
16 Project 19 a little bit later this fall,
17 subregion subsistence planning meetings will
18 be hosted by the TCC and the Upper
19 Kuskokwim, KNA in the Middle Kuskokwim, and
20 AVCP in the Lower Kuskokwim. The dates of
21 these meetings have not been worked out.

22 Project 226. Subsistence
23 division staff in Bethel are being funded to
24 assist Tribal groups and rural organizations
25 to conduct the TEK and harvest monitoring
studies, and they have -- their staff there
have been busy working with the Tribal
groups to help them with these projects.

This concludes my presentation
and I would welcome any question that also
Council members might have.

17 MR. SAM: I've got one. If you
18 know your count, if you know your project
19 goal is going to be incomplete, why begin it
20 if you lose half the season and stuff like
21 that?

22 MR. CANNON: Well, the call, as
23 far as a weir project?

24 MR. SAM: Yes.

25 MR. CANNON: No matter who does
the project, whether it's the State or
Federal or Tribal group, these weir
projects, if you're trying to count through
the whole season, kings through cohos, then,
you know, you're going to try to a certain
date, okay. If you're only going to count

1 kings and chums, if you weren't getting the
2 project in by the 1st of July or the first
couple of weeks of July, then it's not worth
it.

3 If you're going to count cohos,
it's still worth it to try to get the
4 project in. In some of these projects --
big challenge is to just to make sure that
5 you can get the weir in in the first place.

The best time to do that is early
6 in the spring when you have low water. If
you get in there and you get the weir in,
7 you can usually get the whole season.

Some cases, these are brand-new
8 projects and there's just a lot to learn
about the site. That's what -- in many
9 cases the staff out there are doing, they're
getting the camp in, they're working with
10 the weir panels and they're figuring out how
to get it in at that particular site. If
11 they're going to go, we pull the project.
The investigators will pull a project out if
12 it looked like we weren't going to get to
count. We're only going to count chums and
13 kings, they would pull them out if it looked
like it's going to be high water and they
14 couldn't get them in. Because of the cohos,
they did keep trying and got all these in
15 and we were able to get a coho count for the
summer.

16

17 MR. SAM: Any further questions
for Rich?

18 If not, continue.

19 MR. CANNON: Any second report
will review proposed FY2002 Fisheries
20 Monitoring Plan, Kuskokwim region. The
draft plan is found under Tab D-1 of your
21 Council books. The outline of this report
is similar to that of the Yukon.

22 There should be a Tab in -- under
D-1 that indicates Kuskokwim.

23 I'll give you some information
about where things are located in the
24 report, and that will be important to your
deliberations when you talk about your
25 recommendations.

On page 10 there's a regional

1 overview of the 2002 monitoring plan.

2 Table 1 found on page 14 and
3 Table 2 on page 15 list --

4 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Excuse
5 me, some of us are having problems. I want
6 to let them know, after page 74 is where the
7 Kuskokwim starts.

8 MR. CANNON: Was there a Tab
9 there in your books?

10 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: No, there
11 was not.

12 MR. CANNON: We were hoping to
13 get one of those in.

14 MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: I
15 apologize for my interruption.

16 MR. CANNON: That was helpful.
17 Thank you.

18 Has everyone been able to find
19 the report? I apologize for not having that
20 tab in there. That would have helped.

21 When you get to the report, then,
22 on Table 1 on page 14 and Table 2 on page 15
23 lists the project that we'll be talking
24 about.

25 MR. SAM: What were those pages
again, Rich?

MR. CANNON: Page 14 is Table 1;
page 15 is Table 2.

More detailed descriptions of
each project recommended for funding during
FY2002 begin on page 19 for the stock,
status, and trends projects, and page 28 for
the harvest monitoring and TEK projects.

That's where you'll find the more
detailed descriptions that Lester mentioned
that was helpful when you went through the
Yukon. That's where they began if you want
to look at a little more detailed
information.

Okay. I'll continue,
Mr. Chairman.

1 MR. SAM: Go ahead.

2 MR. CANNON: Our priority for
3 FY2002 is to continue improving the
4 monitoring plan we initiated over the last
5 two years.

6 The Kuskokwim fisheries resource
7 coalition also continued its work for 20 02
8 and made valuable recommendations to our
9 program.

10 Given the subsistence
11 restrictions and conservation concerns for
12 chum and chinook salmon, their focus for
13 2002 was to address high-priority data gaps
14 to help us get reliable salmon abundance
15 information for the Kuskokwim River.

16 The Office of Subsistence
17 Management and the Technical Review
18 Committee supports this effort and will
19 continue to work with this local coalition
20 to reevaluate how these projects are working
21 to meet your region's long-term needs.

22 The Technical Review Committee
23 evaluated seven proposed studies for the
24 Kuskokwim with a total cost of about
25 \$539,000.

However, only \$413,000 was
available for FY2002.

The FY2001 funding commitments
that are needed in 2002 will amount to about
\$1.2 million. That's where most of the
money will go for 2002. It will fund those
projects that were approved in FY2001 that
operate for more than one year.

Two of the three fish biology
studies and three of the four harvest
monitoring and TEK projects are proposed for
funding totaling \$394,000.

Consistent with what was
presented in the performance report, stock,
status, and trends projects have been
organized into groups that address the major
issues and data needs identified by the
Councils.

First we will consider the salmon
stock assessment in-season management
projects. There was one project proposed.
This project was recommended by the
Kuskokwim coalition as their highest

1 priority. The issue addressed is the need
2 for salmon abundance information to protect
3 salmon stocks and the subsistence fishery.
4 It's Project 46.

5 Kuskokwim River chinook stock
6 assessment project. This was proposed by
7 the Alaska Department of Fish & Game and
8 KNA. And as I said, it was also endorsed by
9 the coalition.

10 This would provide an estimate of
11 the total number of chinook salmon migrating
12 to the upper river above Old Kalskag.
13 Chinook would be captured by drift wheels
14 and gillnets between Old Kalskag, Aniak and
15 radio tagged.

16 Chinook salmon counted at
17 existing weir projects on the Kuskokwim
18 River combined with the radio tracking data
19 will be used to develop a mark-recapture
20 estimate. This will be a total population
21 estimate for all of the chinook salmon that
22 are migrating beyond that point.

23 The State is adding over \$350,000
24 of their funds to initiate this project. So
25 it's a shared funding as well.

Reason for the committee's
recommendation were the recent chinook stock
declines and subsistence restrictions on the
Kuskokwim River and the need for improved
defensible estimates of total abundance of
chinook salmon.

The next group addresses the need
for more reliable salmon escapement data.
Again, only one proposal was submitted for
this category. Escapement information is
needed for conservation.

Project 117.

This is the Kisaralik River
escapement study.

The Kuskokwim coalition had
identified the need for an escapement
monitoring project on the Kisaralik River as
a very high priority. However, the results
of the field work suggested that a weir
project would not work. This is what was
originally proposed. They found the weir
wouldn't work. It was too big a river.

So, the Technical Review
Committee felt that a mark recapture project
could be used to produce a reliable estimate

1 of escapement into the Kisaralik.

2 However, since the TRC did not
3 have a proposal to do this type of study,
4 they asked the Office of Subsistence
5 Management to develop a request for
6 proposals to do a mark recapture feasibility
7 study.

8 The reasons for recommending this
9 respect the very serious stock declines for
10 chinook and chum salmon and the need to
11 improve escapement objectives and contribute
12 an important component which is the
13 Kisaralik component to the total river
14 estimate of salmon.

15 If your Councils agree to
16 recommend this project, the Office of
17 Subsistence Management will issue a call, a
18 special call for proposals to begin this
19 work on the Kisaralik River this coming
20 year.

21 The next category is stock
22 biology. Only one project was submitted in
23 this category. Stock biology answers the
24 question: Where are local stocks caught?

25 This is Project 95. Kuskokwim
River coho stock biology project. U.S. Fish
& Wildlife Service genetics lab proposed to
expand their capability to use genetic
markers to identify Kuskokwim coho stocks in
mixed-stock fisheries.

The proposers at the Technical
Review Committee's request made major
reductions in their proposed budget and
scope of work.

This is a good project.

However, it was not recommended
and the reason is -- for not recommending it
is the lack of adequate funds -- can't do
everything, and the TRC's feeling that there
was a higher importance for king and chum
salmon projects because of their importance
to subsistence and the current subsistence
restrictions. When they looked at the
priorities, they felt that they wanted to
put the funds -- use the funds for work on
chum and chinook.

Why did stock, status, and trends
project, the harvest monitoring and the
traditional knowledge projects can be
addressed in needs identified by your

1 Councils.

2 MR. SAM: Rich -- Rich?

3 MR. CANNON: Yes.

4 MR. SAM: The reason I cut in, I
5 want to stay the Council, do you want to act
6 on those first three proposals right now?

7 The chairman will entertain a
8 motion to adopt Proposals 02-046 and 02-117
9 as recommended.

10 MR. NICHOLIA: So moved.

11 MR. REAKOFF: Second.

12 MR. SAM: Moved and seconded.
13 Any further discussion?

14 I just need one clarification on
15 02-117. So all we're doing is seeking
16 funding for this right now because it is a
17 big money project?

18 MR. CANNON: It a big money
19 project, Mr. Chairman. We have the funds.
20 What we're seeking your approval on is for
21 us to go ahead and issue a special call for
22 proposals so we'd be asking for Tribal
23 groups or other university or consulting
24 groups to actually bid on this proposal.

25 MR. SAM: Okay. Thank you.

From all indications I've gotten
from the Kuskokwim River, both chinook and
spring and summer and fall chums were of
higher priority than coho because of the
size of runs and historic use.

Any further questions,
discussions on -- Jack?

MR. REAKOFF: I think it's a very
worthwhile project. I have a concern on the
mark and recapture. That's not a problem
with mortalities on that short of distance
between marking and recapture?

MR. CANNON: Well, I can't say
that -- you know, in this case that that
will be what we find. I can tell you in all
the projects -- most projects that we do

1 mark and recapture, we don't see that
2 problem, because the fish aren't traveling
3 those long distances, and that will be the
4 case on this project. So, my judgment is
5 you won't see that situation here, but we'll
6 certainly be looking for it. Because of
7 what's happening in the Upper Yukon,
8 everybody that's doing mark and recapture is
9 going to be looking very closely at the fish
10 handling mortality concern.

11 MR. SAM: Any further questions?
12 Question has been called for.
13 All those in favor --

14 MR. MATHEWS: Mr. Chairman, point
15 of order, your process would be to ask if
16 there's any public testimony. I realize
17 it's late in the evening. It's possible
18 that there could be public testimony on
19 these projects.

20 MR. SAM: Thank you, Vince.
21 Any public testimony, comments?
22 Seeing none present. The
23 question has been called. All those in
24 favor of the motion, signify by saying
25 "aye."

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

16 MR. SAM: Opposed, same sign.
17 Motion carries.
18 Continue, Vince.

19 MR. CANNON: With regard to the
20 harvest assessment projects, one harvest
21 assessment project was submitted. This
22 study addresses the need for subsistence
23 harvest data: Project 36, the Aniak area
24 subsistence post-season harvest survey
25 project which has been conducted by the
subsistence division and now with KNA will
shift the responsibility for conducting this
annual post-season survey for Aniak to KNA
with the intent that this will enable the
association to develop skills and the
capacity to continue with this project in
the future.

Of course, the need for this is

1 we need this kind of data, we need
2 subsistence harvest data.

3 The reasons for recommending the
4 funding include the concern for subsistence
5 salmon, harvest shortages in the middle
6 Kuskokwim, and the opportunity to build
7 capacity in a local Tribal organization.

8 Three, traditional ecological
9 knowledge studies were considered for
10 funding. These studies addressed the need
11 to include Elder and traditional knowledge
12 and subsistence harvest studies, Project 14.
13 The subsistence division, Alaska Department
14 of Fish & Game has proposed a project which
15 focuses on the lower Kuskokwim River fishing
16 area and will examine changes in subsistence
17 salmon fishing patterns for a 40-year period
18 beginning in 1962.

19 The study will document changes
20 in fishing gear, timing of fishing
21 activities, fishing areas, and species
22 harvested based on observations by local
23 subsistence salmon fishing experts and
24 Elders.

25 Project 88. Data on the
subsistence harvest of fish has not been
documented in any of the 12 Bering Sea
communities between the mouths of the
Kuskokwim and the Yukon Rivers.

The Nunakauyak Traditional
Council -- forgive me if I didn't pronounce
that right -- has proposed an integrated TEK
harvest assessment project which would begin
with Toksook to address this significant
harvest data gap and provide indigenous
knowledge regarding fish populations, health
of fish, abundance distribution and
availability over time.

Project 118.

The Kuskokwim Ecological
Knowledge Cooperative originally proposed --
this project was originally proposed by
AVCP, KNA, the marine advisory program, and
State and Federal agencies. However, this
project was withdrawn by the investigators
who intend to resubmit the proposal to the
Councils and Federal Subsistence Board at a
later time. They want to work on more
development of this project.

The reasons for not recommending

1 project -- excuse me, Project 14 and 118
2 recommended for funding to establish a
3 historic long-term view of fisheries
4 resources in the Kuskokwim region, as I
5 mentioned project 118 was withdrawn.

6 These five studies that we're
7 proposing for FY2000 will add content and
8 geographic coverage to the fisheries
9 Resource Monitoring Program for the
10 Kuskokwim region.

11 In summary, the proposed FY2000
12 Fisheries Monitoring Plan will add high
13 priority fisheries projects to what have
14 already been started in FY2000 and FY2001.

15 In-season assessment would be
16 benefited by funding Kuskokwim chinook study
17 using radio tags. In addition the proposed
18 plan will evaluate the feasibility of using
19 tagging to estimate the abundance of chinook
20 and chum salmon escaping in the Kisaralik
21 River. You've already agreed to recommend
22 that these two be done.

23 And post-season subsistence
24 harvest surveys will be conducted by KNA in
25 the Aniak River.

TEK study of Toksook Bay will
begin to develop a long-term perspective of
subsistence fisheries in the Nelson Island
area based on local knowledge.

Then finally, another study will
document the changes that occurred in
subsistence fisheries in the Kuskokwim since
statehood.

This concludes my presentation.
I would welcome any questions.

Mr. Chairman?

MR. SAM: Gerald?

MR. NICHOLIA: I move to accept
02-306, 02-014, and 02-088.

MR. HARRY WILDE, SR.: Second it.

MR. SAM: I have one question at
this time.

02-118 was pulled voluntarily, if
I understood correctly. Is that right?

MR. CANNON: That's correct,

1 Mr. Chairman.

2 MR. SAM: Any further questions,
discussion on the motion?

3 Any public comments, questions?
4 Seeing none, let's call for a
question. We -- all those in favor of the
motion, signify by saying "aye."

5 COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

6 MR. SAM: Opposed, same sign.
7 Motion carries.

8 That takes care of Kuskokwim. Do
we have anything else on monitor?

9 MR. CANNON: Mr. Chairman,
10 Council members, no, that concludes our
presentations. I really thank you for
11 spending this long day with us on this
subject.

12 MR. SAM: I'd like to thank you
too, Rich, on behalf of the three Councils.
13 We cut you off a couple of times. You came
back and gave us more funding.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MR. SAM: I'd like to call a
16 break at this time. I thought you had to
travel and -- you don't have to travel
17 tomorrow.

18 MR. ROCZICKA: Rich has covered
ONC's participation very extensively and as
19 far as concerns go, they will deal more with
game issues at this point in time. This
meeting is more focused on fisheries.

20 MR. SAM: Can you come up to the
21 mike and state that for the record, state
that for the record.

22 This is for the record.

23 MR. ROCZICKA: Mr. Chairman, I
was hollering from the back of the room,
24 Richard just covered fairly well through his
presentation the projects that we had
25 through ONC. Maybe I would add just a
little bit to that, that I came on board in

1 late February, and the way things were
2 structured and set up really made it almost
3 easy for me to come on in more or less a
4 vacuum. I've been out of the fisheries
5 regulatory system for several years and
6 everything was very well structured and it
7 made things very easy to complete everything
8 in a very productive fashion. And just note
9 in-season crew we had a tremendous couple of
10 guys that we ended up with if you add up the
11 total number of contacts they had. They had
over 500 contacts through the course of the
season, that we relayed on then to the
working group. And they gave a pulse of the
fishery on how the run was progressing. I
think the working group found that they
weren't sure since it was a null project
really how to work it into their program. I
think they found it a very, very valuable
tool. I look forward to it again in the
future years.

I would note -- the one fellow we
had working, well, we were supposed to close
down on September 20th to finish up with all
the surveys, he said there's still more
people out there fishing, I'm going back to
check on them. He was out there checking
the families to the end.

On a couple other projects that
we had, it's not always just people from
Bethel that we hire to do these. We get
applications from across the Delta, and
we're trying to find people who are really
interested in the management field and some
of these projects have been ongoing for
several years now. I think three out of the
five have been hired as employees of Fish &
Game. So it is working and serving its
purpose. The guy working -- we had another
project that wasn't mentioned here, through
Bering Sea Fishermen's Association, actually
came from Mountain Village. It's drawing
people from throughout the region getting
them involved.

Thank you for your time. Unless
you have other questions.

MR. SAM: Any questions for Greg
and are you coming back, my first question
are you coming back tomorrow, or is that the

1 extent.

2 MR. ROCZICKA: For ONC. I'd like
3 to address the Council on another matter
4 that was brought before you in another
5 resolution: I'd like to give you some more
6 information along those lines, not through
7 ONC, as an individual.

8 MR. SAM: We'll come back to you
9 tomorrow. That's the reason I called you
10 up. Thank you, Greg.

11 MR. ROCZICKA: Mr. Chairman.

12 MR. SAM: Under special reports,
13 only Jill Klein, everybody else cut in on
14 everybody else and since I called on ONC,
15 does anyone have to leave tomorrow morning
16 from AVCP, CATG, or KNA or Tanana Chiefs?
17 Vince?

18 MR. MATHEWS: I had conversation
19 with Jill Klein and she felt due to the way
20 the time was going here that she would pass
21 on presenting tonight, and I have late word
22 that she would like to speak tomorrow on
23 that. Jennifer -- I don't remember
24 Jennifer's -- Hooper, spoke to me and she
25 had a scheduling conflict tonight, and she
felt that she had already covered a lot of
her topics.

Again, she may come back tomorrow
and we'll ask her again. But she would be
representing the Association of Village
Council Presidents.

So, she indicated most likely,
she will not speak because her topic is
already covered.

That's all I had to report from
the different groups that approached me as
the agenda changed and the time schedule.

MR. SAM: Just out of courtesy,
we owe some time to Jill Klein because we
covered everybody else on that special
reports. So pass that message along.

What's the pleasure of councils?

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.: Recess.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. SAM: Make that in the form
of a motion.

MR. LESTER WILDE, SR.:
Mr. Chairman, in that case I would like to
move we recess until tomorrow morning at
8:30.

MR. SAM: Okay, motion, is there
a second?

MR. NICHOLIA: Second.

MR. SAM: Before we go, though, I
think the word has been given out that
National Marine Services be on at 8:30 in
the morning, so with that, we'll just put
them on and then catch up on our agenda.

All those in favor of recessing
until 8:30 in the morning, signify by saying
"aye."

COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SAM: Opposed, same sign.

(Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta, Western
Interior, and Eastern Interior Regional
Subsistence Advisory Councils Joint Meeting
adjourned at 7:55 p.m.)

1
2 I, Sandra M. Mierop, Certified
3 Realtime Reporter, do hereby certify that
4 the above and foregoing contains a true and
5 correct transcription of the Yukon-Kuskokwim
6 Delta, Western Interior, and Eastern
7 Interior Federal Subsistence Regional
8 Advisory Council Joint Meeting reported by
9 me on the 10th day of October, 2001.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Sandra M. Mierop, CRR, RPR, CSR

